



VOLUME VIII

FEBRUARY, 1922

NUMBER 2

BULLETIN

OF

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ANNUAL MEETING

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS: OUR ASSOCIATION
ORGANIZATION OF FRENCH UNIVERSITIES
REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

PUBLISHED BY

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD

CAMBRIDGE

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Annual Meeting.....	3
Foreign University Conditions.....	5
President's Address: Our Association, <i>Edwin R. A. Seligman</i> ...	6
Organization of French Universities, <i>J. Cavalier</i>	27
Reports from Committees	
Committee A (Academic Freedom and Tenure).....	36
Committee B (Appointments and Promotions).....	58
Committee G (Intellectual Interest and Standards of Under- graduates)	60
Committee H (Migration of Graduate Students).....	70
Committee P (Pensions and Insurance).....	73
Committee W (Status of Women in Colleges and Universi- ties).....	87
Proposals for a College Constitution.....	88
Nominations for Membership.....	90

ANNUAL MEETING

The eighth annual meeting of the Association was held at Pittsburgh, with delegates representing 54 institutions.

A notable feature of the meeting was Dr. Seligman's presidential address, "Our Association" (printed elsewhere in this BULLETIN), delivered at a largely attended joint session with the Economic and Political Science Associations.

Reports were presented by a large number of committees, and several of these reports are printed in this number of the BULLETIN.

Definite action was taken on the following matters:

Appointments and Promotions.—The Committee was requested to confer with the Director of the American Council on Education in regard to the proposed establishment of a National Appointment and Personnel Office, the Association approving the general principle.

Pensions and Insurance.—The recommendations of the Committee were adopted as stated on page 73. It was further voted to be the sense of the Association that:

Whenever the greater part of the assets of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association consists of accumulated contributions from individual policy-holders and their institutions, the preponderance of membership of the governing body should also consist of representatives of those policy-holders and institutions.

Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure.—Chairman Deibler presented the report printed elsewhere in this BULLETIN. It was voted: That this Association regards as desirable the plans suggested by the Secretary, and approved by the Committee for the eventual formulation of a code covering the questions of academic freedom and tenure by joint action of this Association and other organizations; and that it refers the matter to the new Council with power to take any action it may see fit.

Place and Function of Faculties in University Government and Administration.—The specific proposals of the Committee (published in the November-December BULLETIN) were discussed at length and the following resolutions adopted:

That the formal consent of the Faculty directly or through its elected representatives should be prerequisite to all changes in educational policy.

That in the opinion of this Association there should be in every college or university an officially recognized medium of communication between the Trustees and the Faculty other than the President for the adjustment of all questions of policy and administration that may arise.

That in the opinion of the Association it is desirable that there should be provision for periodic conferences on matters of educational policy or institutional conditions between Governing Boards and Faculties or their elected representatives; that either body may properly take initiative for such conference.

That it is the sense of the Association that the Faculty should, acting through appropriate committees, of which the administrative officers are *ex-officiis* members, make nominations for appointments and promotion on the teaching staff.

That it is the sense of the Association that in the choice of a President the Faculty should be officially consulted either through duly elected representatives or by action of the whole Faculty; that this should apply also in the case of a Dean of the Faculty concerned.

That it is the sense of the Association that faculty participation in nominations carries with it the corresponding responsibility to take initiative in removing from the teaching staff incompetent as well as unworthy members.

The question of faculty participation in the determination of the general salary scale was laid on the table.

Constitutional Amendments.—These were adopted in general conformity with the proposals in the November-December BULLETIN and have been published in the January BULLETIN.

Particular attention may be called to the change of title of Local Branches to Chapters. A sub-committee has been appointed to draw up an appropriate statement on the functions of Chapters.

Bulletin.—The Council was requested to consider the desirability and practicability of establishing a University Journal in place of the present BULLETIN, with power to proceed at its discretion.

Summer Meeting.—The question of holding a summer meeting or a meeting independent of other bodies was discussed and referred to the Council with power.

Plans for 1922.—The choice of time and place of the annual meeting was referred to the Executive Committee with power. The suggestion of a summer meeting and of a separate meeting was not favorably considered.

The choice of committees other than G to report at the next annual meeting and to propose topics for discussion during the year was also left to the Executive Committee with power.

A motion that the Council be requested to invite the Association of American Universities and similar bodies to send each a representative to the annual meeting was referred to the new Council for a recommendation to the next annual meeting.

The following committees were appointed for 1922: Nominating Committee, J. A. Leighton (Ohio), L. J. Richardson (California), G. D. Hancock (Washington and Lee), C. E. Mendenhall (Wisconsin), A. N. Holcombe (Harvard).

Executive Committee: J. V. Denney (Ohio), Edward Capps (Princeton), Henry Crew (Northwestern), A. O. Lovejoy (Johns Hopkins), W. T. Semple (Cincinnati), H. W. Tyler (Mass. Inst. Tech.), M. P. Whitney (Vassar).

FOREIGN UNIVERSITY CONDITIONS

The following letter from our former Vice-President will be self-explanatory:

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 16, 1922.

Dear Professor Tyler:

Referring to the copies of Professor Seligman's letters to Mr. Hoover and to you, and to Louis Levine's cablegram to Professor Seligman with regard to possibilities of help for Russian university professors, I may say that the American Relief Administration is already giving this matter some special attention. We have been able to establish special relief measures for "intellectuals" in Austria and Poland. In Vienna and in each of three other university cities in Austria there is maintained a "Professors' Mess." The Mess in Vienna provides now for about 350 professors. Recently some additional funds have come to hand for the support of special relief for "intellectuals" in Austria and additional messes will be set up. I think that without any doubt something of the same kind, if not to the same extent, can be done in Russia. In the meantime, any one wishing to extend special food relief to professors of Russian universities can do this through the food remittance system which provides for the deposit with the New York office of the AMERICAN RELIEF ADMINISTRATION, 42 BROADWAY, of sums of ten dollars or multiples of that amount with the address of the particular individual or group of individuals whom the donor wishes to help.

For the special relief of "intellectuals" in Austria and Poland the Commonwealth Fund has made several gifts to the American Relief Administration and it may be that the manager of this Fund will be willing to do something for Russia.

Very sincerely yours,

VERNON KELLOGG.

OUR ASSOCIATION—ITS AIMS AND ITS ACCOMPLISHMENTS*

I

The American Association of University Professors has reached the age of seven years. It still has before it the growing pains of a lusty adolescence, and it is entirely too soon to say what it will resemble when it reaches its period of maturity. But just as the fond parent cherishes the highest aspirations for his youthful progeny, so we older men who are helping to mold the fortunes of this Association may be pardoned if from time to time we endeavor to formulate its ideals, modified as they inevitably must be by the possibilities of accomplishment and by the experience of what has already been achieved during the short life of our Association.

In regard to certain points, there is room indeed for but little discussion. In the original call for the organization meeting certain aspects of our work have been so admirably presented that little or nothing can be added. We can, for instance, not improve upon the paragraph which sets forth the general purposes of our Association as follows:

"To facilitate a more effective cooperation among the members of the profession in the discharge of their special responsibilities as custodians of the interests of higher education and research in America; to promote a more general and methodical discussion of problems relating to education in higher institutions of learning; to create means for the authoritative expression of the public opinion of college and university teachers; to make collective action possible; and to maintain and advance the standards and ideals of the profession."

Several of these points have been elaborated in some of the admirable presidential addresses. It has, for instance, been made abundantly clear that our Association must be regarded not as a trade union, but rather as an association comparable to the American Bar Association, or to the American Medical Association—an institution designed to foster common interests and to uphold professional standards.

*Address by President Edwin R. A. Seligman.

It is to be regretted, however, that there is still a lack of clear understanding as to the more precise aims of our Association, and this lack of understanding which is so evident in many who are not members of our Association is found even among some of our own members. One reason for this misapprehension, and for the failure to draw a clear-cut and sharp line between what is and what is not allowable, is to be sought in the educational transition through which America is now passing. We call ourselves an Association of University Professors but we have from the beginning, and especially since the recent liberalization of our entrance requirements, included also representatives from our colleges. While the presidents of our higher institutions of learning have seen fit to organize in separate bodies such as the Association of American Universities and the Association of American Colleges, we have one big union. There is indeed a valid reason for this, as we shall see in a moment; but, nevertheless, there remain certain elements in the problem which go far to explain some of our difficulties.

Let us, then, say a word about the college and the university in its influence on our problem.

In its origin there was no danger of confusing the two terms. The *universitas* was the community of scholars and at first primarily the community of students who banded together for a training in the *studium generale*. It might be described as denoting in its origin a scholastic gild within the *studium*. The term was soon applied to the gild of teachers—the masters of their craft, who became known as *doctores* or *professores*. After a time, however, we hear no longer of the *universitas scholarium* or even of the *universitas doctorum*, but of the *universitas studii*. By this time the word “university” was identified with the *studium generale* until it became synonymous with the institution, and acquired its modern significance.

The term “college,” from the other Latin word for group, was also applied to both teachers and students. In fact we hear of the college or gild of master-teachers even while “university” denoted the gild of students. But when the word “college” was first applied to students, it signified a group of the poorer students and more especially an eleemosynary foundation or home for the poorer students. The early college, therefore, was a group within a group,—a group of intimates who ate together or resided together in a separate building. The university for a long time possessed no home, the students meeting either in the professors’ lodgings or in some public building.

The student body was at first composed of scholars of all ages—mature and immature. As an outgrowth in many places of the cathedral school, the university took the grammar boys at an early period and kept them until the final degree was awarded. This degree was that of doctor or master—for the one denoted the other. In conferring this degree, there were two steps—the licentiate, or license to teach (*licentia docendi*), and the subsequent formal installation into the guild of teachers through the *inceptio*, or commencement. Long before the student, however, became a master-doctor, invested with the full privileges of his high office, he might receive the right to do some elementary teaching. Borrowing the term from the ordinary craft guilds, he might become a bachelor, allowed to give certain so-called “cursory lectures.” In other words, the bachelor was a pupil-teacher. This right was conferred upon him after a so-called “determination,” i.e., the maintaining or defending of a thesis, generally very boyish in character. The baccalaureate accordingly became a kind of inferior degree.

The schoolboys entered at an early age. In Paris, students were admitted to some of the colleges at the age of eight to nine* and had to be at least fourteen before becoming a bachelor or twenty before attaining the licentiate. At Padua, after a time, students under thirteen were excluded from the vote.† While the time required to attain the degree of bachelor in arts with the customary curriculum of the *trivium* and the *quadrivium* varied widely at first, it settled down by the end of the thirteenth century to about four years, both on the continent and in England.

At first the only calling which could lay claim to be a learned profession was the church. The early medieval doctor was accordingly in most cases a doctor of theology. In the course of time, however, two other callings were accepted as learned professions. First the law, the recognition of which as a science came with the growth of medieval commerce and industry in the towns on the Mediterranean and then gradually spread to France and Germany. The development of the civil law in the south and the reception of the civil law in the north,—welcomed by the conservatives as a means of strengthening the existing rights of private property,—contributed to perpetuate the law faculties in the medieval universities. A little later came the

*H. Rashdall—*The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, I, 492.

†*Ibid.*, II, 19.

advance in medicine. The path, however, was not easy, as is shown by the fact that until far into the Middle Ages, surgery, which consisted for the most part of blood-letting, was practised chiefly by the barbers, a situation which explains the existence not only of the gild of barber-surgeons, but also the familiar red and white sign still found to-day in our tonsorial establishments. When we speak to-day of the doctor as denoting the physician, we forget that the doctor of medicine was the last of the doctors in the Middle Ages. The doctor's degree, moreover, now became not so much an evidence of ability to teach as a distinction coveted by the practitioner and of use to him in improving his means of livelihood. The distinguished lawyer, like the great physician, was always a doctor or master.

The growth of these new professions and the change in the real meaning of the degree led to interesting results. To keep a man four years in order to attain the bachelor's degree and then to require the additional years demanded for the doctor's degree became a considerable hardship. A doctor of medicine or of laws no longer felt like devoting to the attainment of the professional degree the many years originally required for the doctor of divinity. We therefore find a pressure upon the university to reduce the length of the period required for preparation for entrance upon active life. The simplest method of effecting this result was to shorten the preparatory period—for the need of technical training precluded any material change in the professional course. This process was rendered easier by the improvement in what we should call to-day the grammar schools. First, the period for the attainment of the bachelor's degree was shortened to three years, then to two years. By the end of the fifteenth century it had been reduced to a year and one-half and even to one year, until finally it vanished, and with it the bachelor's degree itself. We know almost to a year when this happened in the various universities. On the European continent the process was completed by the sixteenth century, and the universities, relegating the introductory curriculum in arts to preparatory institutions, now devoted themselves entirely to what we should call the higher education, the completion of the course still being crowned by the customary doctor's degree, which admitted the candidate to the gild, or group of masters.

England followed a somewhat different path, although the reasons for this difference have never, so far as I know, been adequately explained. The colleges which were created at Oxford and Cam-

bridge did not in their inception differ from those that we find in the continental universities. The fundamental distinction, however, between the English and the continental development is that in England the bachelor's degree was retained and conferred at a somewhat later age, while the higher degree gradually disappeared. It became customary to use the name "master's degree" in the Faculty of Arts, while the doctor's degree was reserved for the other faculties; and in the process of time, not only did the need of examination or even of residence for the master's degree disappear, but the rôle of doctor was reserved almost exclusively for the theologians. Thus, "at the present day," writes the historian of Oxford in 1895,* "the highest degree which it is in the power of the University of Oxford to bestow has come to be the reward of eleven years passed in forgetting the minimum of knowledge required in the Pass Schools of the Faculty of Arts."

What is the reason for this remarkable difference? So far as I can see, it is due to two causes. In the first place, there was no science of law in England and therefore no learned legal profession. The common law of the time differed in fundamental respects from the civil law. The slowly developing common law occupied, with its insistence upon precedents, very much the same position that the Roman law did during its early period of growth. The civil law as practised in the Middle Ages and as found in the pandects soon developed all the earmarks of a veritable science. The legal discipline, as formulated by the great doctors in the medieval law schools, attracted mature students by the thousands. In England, however, where there never had been any reception of the civil law and where admission to the bar depended not upon any evidence of knowledge but, as is still the case to-day, upon the eating of a certain number of dinners at the Inns of Court, there was no demand for a university law course and no need for the degree of doctor of laws or of jurisprudence. On the other hand, Oxford and Cambridge were both such small hamlets as to preclude the possibility of any adequate hospital service and the British medical education, such as it was, developed in London and in a few other large towns where there were hospitals but no institutions of learning. There was accordingly in Oxford and Cambridge neither opportunity nor demand for a university education looking toward the degree of doctor of medicine.

* Rashdall, *op. cit.*, II, 451.

Not only, therefore, was there in England no pressure from above to supplement the bachelor's degree with the doctor's degree, but the absence of any organized public-school system, in our sense of the term, resulted in no pressure being brought to bear at the beginning of the course. On the continent, the bachelor's curriculum was gradually ground between the upper and the nether millstones, the upper millstone of preparation for the learned professions, the nether millstone of the slowly developing secondary schools which ultimately became known as the *lycée* in the Latin-American countries and the *gymnasium* in the Teutonic countries. In England, where there was neither the upper nor the nether millstone, the higher faculties preserved only a paper organization, while the bachelor's curriculum remained, and the colleges in and through which the bachelor's degree was obtained became the really important parts of the university. In England, consequently, the university grew to be a mere congeries of colleges intended to educate the youth of the ruling class and to give them a culture befitting a gentleman; on the continent, on the other hand, the university became the means of enabling the more mature student from every class of society to secure a training calculated to fit him for a professional career, in the course of which the colleges, intended primarily for the younger students, disappeared and only the universities remained. What will be the result of the movement that is now visible in Great Britain it would be interesting to consider, but lies without the bounds of this address. But at all events it is easy to foresee that the recent reintroduction of professional training culminating in the doctor's degree will meet with much more resistance than was the case on the continent in abolishing or even modifying the existing colleges.

In this country, with its absence of tradition, the transition that has taken place is analogous to that which occurred on the continent. Our institutions of higher learning started out as colleges, which were nothing but grammar schools under theological auspices. So far as they trained for any career, it was for that of preacher. Precisely as on the continent, the requirements for admission were gradually raised, and the normal term for the acquisition of the principal degree, that of bachelor, came to be four years. The early American college was remarkably similar to the preparatory stage of the early medieval university in four fundamental respects: theological control, content of the curriculum with its emphasis upon

classics and mathematics, four-year duration of the course, and a degree of bachelor at the completion. Owing to English influence, there was no scholastic provision for any higher degree, except that the master of arts was occasionally granted in course while preparation for law and medicine was carried on outside of the college halls.

The last few decades have, however, witnessed the beginning of the same movement as that which developed in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries on the continent—on the one hand, the need for professional education; on the other hand, the multiplication and improvement of the high schools. Accordingly, similar results are discernible. In some colleges, the curriculum has already been reduced to, or made possible of accomplishment in, three years; in others, the curricula have been telescoped so as to provide for a shorter combined academic and professional course; in still others, a distinction has been made between the so-called junior and senior colleges, drawing the line at the end of two years; and in some cases, as notably in California, there is a strong movement to lop off entirely the junior college. What it took the continent of Europe, however, several centuries to accomplish can of course not be achieved here in a generation.

The lesson to be derived from this historical sketch is that the difficulties of our Association are in no small measure connected with the fact that nearly all our American institutions of higher learning combine the functions of the college and of the university, and that most of the teachers are engaged in work of both sorts. Whatever the future may bring forth, we are at present, so to speak, largely in a twilight zone. This ambiguous character of our American institutions—whether bearing the name of college or university—is accentuated by the fact that the fourth year of the college and sometimes even the third year has become in not a few of our larger institutions, in both form and content of instruction, indistinguishable from the succeeding years of the university proper. Although the two functions are performed largely in the same institutions and often by the same persons, it is obvious that they are, in important respects, distinct functions. In the one case the teacher is dealing with mature and in the other case with immature students; in the one case he imparts training primarily by lecture, and in the other by recitation; in the one case attention is centered upon research, in the other upon teaching; in the one case he is addressing pre-

sumably free spirits and must therefore have the most unbounded liberty of expression, in the other he is molding opinion rather than inviting reflection and must therefore be far more circumspect. Clearly, it cannot be assumed that the methods and principles applicable to the one function can be applied without modification to the other.

If, however, the history of European universities, as sketched above, is to afford us any indication of the future, it is probable that in the United States, also, this duality will disappear in the course of time. Through this reorganization of our higher educational system, a continually larger part of the present undergraduate course or college will probably be relegated to the secondary schools or to separate institutions like junior colleges, and the student will enter upon his distinctly university work at an earlier age than that at which he now begins his "graduate," or professional, course. When that stage is reached, there will be as little danger of confusing the university with the college as there is of confusing the latter with the high school. At present, however, the two kinds of work are, in all but a very few advanced institutions, so inseparably intertwined on the administrative side, in financial support, and even in the persons of those who carry them on, that it would be out of the question to attempt to establish separate organizations of college and university teachers as if they already composed two distinct groups. So far as the distinction can now be made, it is usually a distinction not of kind but of degree; and our interests, and for the most part our duties and responsibilities, we share in common. It is to these common interests and duties that I now wish to address myself, while at the same time calling attention at certain points to the difficulties which arise from the duality of function, to which attention has been directed.

II

Common interests may be approached from two distinct points of view. When the United States became a nation, the recognition of the common interests assumed the form of a statement of the rights and privileges which the people ought to enjoy in common. In the same way, in the French Revolution, the *Constituante* followed the Declaration of Independence by emphasizing the natural rights of the citizen. It was not until half a century later that Mazzini introduced into the field of common interests of the new democracy the con-

ception of duty rather than of right. His great book has done perhaps more than anything else to inculcate in modern society the idea that obligation is a correlative of privilege and that duties no less than rights are to be considered when we think of the warp and woof of common interests.

If, therefore, I take up first our common rights, I wish to be understood as conceiving of these rights not so much in themselves, as opportunities, as rights to perform services through which we may absolve ourselves of our duty. Reserving, then, a consideration of our common duties until a little later, let us begin with our rights.

There are four fundamental rights which our Association has been attempting to emphasize. These are, in turn, security of tenure, liberty of thought and expression, adequate leisure, and reasonable compensation. In each one of these, however, except the last, there is a difference in degree between the college and the university.

The right to a reasonable compensation may be dismissed with the word, not only because it is a right which we share with all other classes in the community, but also because there has been, in recent years, a gratifying recognition of the fact on the part of the public at large. It goes without saying that in an abnormal situation like that through which we have just been passing, the burden of an abrupt change in the general level of prices is always borne by the salaried classes and the recipients of fixed income. For these are always among the last to have their situation adjusted to the new economic equilibrium. We are only too sadly familiar with the sacrifices that have been imposed upon the educators here and abroad, and with the oftentimes unworthy shifts to which they have been reduced. Not only our educational authorities, however, but the public has begun to realize that if it is desired to retain in the work of higher education the type of man or woman to whose services the students are entitled, vigorous effort must be made to grant a compensation that is suitable to the office. Much still needs to be accomplished, and there is abundant room for a discussion of the principles which ought to govern in the apportionment and gradation of salaries. But whatever may ultimately be recognized as the sound method, it is fairly clear that there ought to be no distinction in this respect between the college and the university instructor. Whatever may be the difference in functions, we cannot admit the legitimacy of a difference in importance: if each is satisfactorily fulfilling his function, there can be no tenable ground for demanding a differentiation in

compensation. Reasonable compensation may indeed be interpreted as meaning reasonable from the point of view of the class as a whole or reasonable from the point of view of individual achievement. But whether we accept the principle of a standardized or of a specialized salary which differs from individual to individual, it would be both invidious and unfortunate, in the present stage of American education, to distinguish between collegiate and university salaries.

In the case of security of tenure, however, the situation is possibly a little different. It goes without saying that in a certain sense security of tenure is an indefeasible right of all of us. In the economic world of to-day it is coming more and more to be recognized that perhaps the greatest evil connected with the lot of the workmen is the uncertainty of employment. When each weekly pay envelope may be his last, it is only natural that his interest in the economic process should be limited to the reception of that envelope. But if insecurity of tenure is now recognized by our leading thinkers and foremost captains of industry as the center of the problem of industrial unrest, how much more true is the fact when applied to the guild of teachers. We need security of tenure in order to bring out what is best in us; we need it in order to divert our thoughts from the compensation to the opportunities of our position; we need it in order to give us that peace of mind without which good work is impossible; we need it in order to feel assured that we shall not be exposed to the gusts of caprice and the shifting winds of institutional fortunes; we need it, in short, in order to be really ourselves and not a mere counterfeit or presentment of our better selves.

While this is true of all of us, there are certain differences. In the case of a teacher engaged primarily in directing the work of advanced students and chosen chiefly for his powers of research and his ability to make fresh contributions to knowledge, it is necessary to go to the extreme length in the matter of security of tenure. In a true university the fact that the professor may deteriorate in his constructive powers, or may no longer be able to attract the students who have hitherto thronged to his lectures, cannot be permitted in the least to endanger his position. The time to exercise this scrutiny is at the period of his appointment: if he runs the gauntlet then, it is quite sufficient; for any other course would react disastrously upon the welfare of the group as a whole. It is for this reason that in the universities abroad we find acceptance of the principle: "Once a pro-

fessor, always a professor." He may stop his research, he may cease his lectures, he may go so far even as to give offense to this or that class: he is still virtually irremovable. The risk in the case of the individual professor is accepted for the sake of the dignity and the standing of the profession as a whole.

It is manifestly difficult, however, to apply the same principle to a teacher whose chief or exclusive employment is the instruction of more or less immature students, especially in the earlier years of our present college course. One engaged in such employment must at any rate be able to *teach*; and if, for lack of the qualities necessary in that function or for any other reason, he is now incompetent to fill the position, it is not always easy to decide as to how far he should continue to be imposed upon the students. It is not of course a question of illness or of a failure, through no fault of the individual, to go on acceptably with his work; for the ordinary dictates of humanity, of kindness, and of the duty of colleagues to each other may be expected to take care of such cases. The real problem arises where the efficiency of institution as a whole is impaired, and where the students would be better off with a severance of the relations. An absolute security of tenure would in such a case be really detrimental to progress.

What we have a right to demand, however, is that even in such cases, whether of moral obliquity or extreme inefficiency, the individual should be protected against injustice, whim, or arbitrariness; that due notice of the proposed action be given; that a properly constituted tribunal of his peers be erected; that he have a right to be heard in his defense; and that the utmost measure of consideration be shown if a severance of the relations ultimately becomes necessary. Even where there is no inviolability of position, the individual must be protected in the demand for a reasonable security of tenure.

Much the same argument applies to the right of liberty of thought and expression. It goes without saying that in an institution which is devoted primarily to widening the horizon of mankind and of broadening the field of knowledge anything which interferes in even the slightest degree with the liberty of thought and expression is quite inadmissible. We are still so densely ignorant, we are still groping so blindly for the light to illumine the world of thought and action, that even the slightest impediment put upon the freest exercise of our intelligence would be fatal. It would be just as absurd to remove from the laboratory of the chemist or physicist

certain vials and instruments which are marked "forbidden" as it would be to put athwart the path of the philosopher obstacles to the fullest fruition of his independent thought. In a world where no one believes what his father has believed, where well nigh everything is in a state of flux, where political and especially economic institutions are perpetually subject to change, how fatal to human progress would it be if the slightest brake were put on the effort of the human mind to convert the unknown into the known!

But should the teacher of elementary subjects in the opening years of the college enjoy quite the same measure of freedom in his methods and utterances in the classroom? Instead of mature students who are eager to hear the last word of striving in human thought and who have the capacity to subject the utterances of the professor to the close criticism of the trained mind, we may be dealing with a group of callow youths whose only interest it is to get a point of view or to receive a nugget of reputed wisdom. Has not, for instance, the teacher of elementary economics to a class of beginners a different responsibility from the leader of an advanced seminar? Does he not owe a certain respect to the feelings, aye, even to the prejudices, of his entourage? Has he the same right to be cynical or destructive? Must he not observe a certain moderation, at least in expression?

Not a few of the cases of alleged infraction of the liberty of thought which have been presented to our committee on academic freedom have been on this border line of what is or is not allowable. Do we strengthen the legitimacy of the general principle by applying it to doubtful cases? It is, of course, never permissible to subject to a censorship the opinions of even the elementary schoolteacher who does not by his teaching or his personality exert an unfortunate influence on his pupils. It is sadly true that in a time like the present, where mankind is being swayed more by emotions than by intellect, and where we, especially in America, have been swept by the passions of war from so many of our ancient moorings, even this principle has not infrequently been violated. It is moreover indispensable that any limitations or regulations designed to affect even the elementary college instructor should be framed, not by the administrative authorities, but by his own associates in the department or his academic colleagues in the country at large. The point that I am seeking to emphasize, however, is that we must not exaggerate, and that if we apply the principle of absolute liberty of thought and

expression to cases where it is only in part relevant we jeopardize the maintenance of the principle itself.

The fourth point is the right of leisure. By leisure, of course we do not mean the leisure to idle—although it is quite true that all work and no play is apt to make the professorial Jack a very dull boy. What we have in mind is the leisure necessary to enable us to put forth our best efforts and to achieve real self-expression. There is a threefold aspect of this right to leisure,—freedom from excessive hours in the classroom or lecture hall, freedom from undue participation in committee and administrative work, and the freedom from continuous labor, which takes the form of the sabbatical year, with its opportunity for spiritual refreshment and the chance of accomplishing some extra-curricular task.

In all these respects there is, indeed, a difference. But the difference is one of such slight degree that it can safely be neglected. For while the scholar who devotes himself primarily to research naturally needs more leisure in which to make his preparations and to carry on his work, it is undoubtedly true that the college instructor must also be protected from the eternal grind of excessive recitation periods and undue participation in administrative work. Our best teachers are those who seek to keep pace with the progress of their particular discipline and who retain their enthusiasm by undertaking some constructive work in the science itself. All of us, university professors and college teachers, are almost equally interested in the maintenance of this freedom from immoderate work.

This matter is perhaps the most important of all at present confronting our Association. How frequent has been our experience in turning out brilliant graduates who acquitted themselves admirably in the laboratory or the seminar and from whom we had every right to expect a continuance of the career so auspiciously begun,—how frequently have our expectations been disappointed by the fact that this promising graduate has accepted a college position the fancied exigencies of which have compelled him to devote from twelve to twenty hours a week in the deadly grind of elementary classroom recitation, and who has, in addition, often been drafted to serve on endless committees or to aid the administration. During the very years most propitious for new ideas, for constructive effort, and for sustained enthusiasm, the lack of a decent amount of leisure saps the enthusiasm and circumscribes the ambition, until the mettlesome steed becomes the steady but dull dray horse. There is

perhaps nothing in our entire system so responsible for the paucity of really distinguished scholars to be found with us, and for the fact that, notwithstanding our wealth, our numbers, and the quantity of our output, the quality of the scientific work thus far accomplished by American scholars has as yet failed to put us, with a few notable exceptions, in the same class with our foreign colleagues. It is not the youth of this country, as it often is alleged; it is not our predisposition to material pursuits; it is not any native lack of ability in our scholars: it is, in my judgment, almost entirely the result of the inchoate organization of our higher institutions of learning and of the mistaken conceptions of our governing bodies as to what really constitutes a university. In the field of economic life it has only recently been recognized that a shorter working-day for the laborer leads to greater output and to more wealth for the community, including the employer, as well as to more welfare on the part of the laborer. How long will it be before we apply the conclusions of the economic life to the facts of intellectual life? How long must we wait before the fallacy of the alleged economy of long hours in the institutions of learning is acknowledged, and the advantages of a reasonable amount of leisure are recognized as conducing not only to the efficiency of the instructor, but to the best interests of the institution and of the community which it serves?

III

Let us turn now from a consideration of our rights to a discussion of our duties. It is here not only that we are more conscious of our common interests, but that it is important for us to emphasize the true aspirations of our Association. If we are different from a trade union,—if we are really desirous of maintaining high standards and insuring the progress in the academic life of which we form a part,—we shall be drawn more closely together by an appreciation of our opportunities rather than of our privileges, of our duties rather than of our rights.

Our duties, as I see them, are of a fourfold character,—duties to the institution, duties to the students, duties to the community and duties to science. A word as to each of these.

It goes without saying that we owe a wholehearted loyalty to the institution with which we may happen to be connected. It is one of the elementary obligations that scarcely need to be emphasized,

that we must to the best of our ability aid the authorities in carrying on, and in helping to make the work not only of our department but of the institution as a whole more efficient. But loyalty to our institution is like patriotism in politics. We may not indeed agree in believing with Dr. Johnson that an appeal to patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel, but we can certainly not refuse to recognize the growth of the new internationalism. While the world constitution of the future will no doubt be based on the continued existence of a vigorous and progressive nationalism, it is none the less true that our loyalty to the higher ideal will necessitate the exercise of a discriminating patriotism at home which will not hesitate to criticise when helpful and constructive criticism is needed. So, in the same way, loyalty to our own college and university is not incompatible with loyalty to the higher idea for which the institution stands. We want, indeed, and must demand, active cooperation with the President and the Trustees, but we do not need and cannot brook the indiscriminating acceptance of every plank in the institutional platform. The higher loyalty to our institution must be so interpreted as to render possible an independent weighing of the arguments for some special policy, and to evoke our best efforts in aiding or retarding, as the case may be, some particular movement. "My country, right or wrong" has no application in the academic sphere. In the present welter of institutional life it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the right path; and he would indeed be venturesome who would hazard the affirmation that his particular institution is in all respects headed in the right direction. Loyalty to our institution is entirely compatible with the courage of criticism and the intrepidity of constructive suggestion.

Our second duty is to our students. This duty we are sometimes inclined to take too lightly. The situation is now far different from that found in the medieval universities where the professors were engaged by, and subject to the control of, the students. How interesting would it be to-day if, as in Bologna, the professors in signing their contracts for a certain remuneration agreed with the students to cover a definite part of the subject within a fixed period, so that if a certain *punctum* was not reached by a given date, the lecturer would expose himself to all the rigors of the penalty, pecuniary or otherwise. To-day it is the professor, and not the student, who is on top. But with power there comes responsibility. I have often wondered whether we are all fully conscious of our present responsi-

bilities. I do not speak of the elementary duties which we owe to our students, whether in the recitation room or the lecture hall,—the duties of courtesy, of impartiality, of imperturbability, of open-mindedness, and of patience. These go without saying. But are we always entirely alive to our larger responsibilities, the responsibilities of adequate preparation which connotes far more than keeping one lesson ahead of the student or than rehashing from year to year the ideas which at one time were invested with a certain freshness? Duty to our students involves the larger duties to ourselves, the duty to insist at all hazards upon our own intellectual growth, and upon the constant broadening of our human sympathies. It is so easy to recline complacently in our chair, so simple to cut our coat according to the cloth, so convenient to rest on our oars. A proper interpretation of our duty to our students implies a perpetual enthusiasm, a continual reaching out into new fields, a divine discontent with our achievements.

The third duty is that to the community, of which our institution forms a part. Entirely mistaken are those who believe that the academic teacher must be a cloistered recluse, aloof from the struggles of the marketplace or the contests of the political arena. No matter what the particular branch of the science may be to which the academic professor is devoted, he cannot disassociate himself from his fellow-men. Primarily, because he stands for intellectual achievements his opinion will be sought by his fellow-men. With the growing mastery of science over nature and with the increasing application of science to every phase of human life, the community is daily brought into closer contact with the academician. How indefensible, then, would be the position that we are under no obligations to help when our aid is demanded. It is not simply of the social and political interests of the community, important though these are, that I am speaking. I refer to the manifold activities of an intelligent and democratic community, which run through the whole gamut of present-day life and touch at numberless points the interests of every thinking man. We have no right to wrap ourselves in the mantle of superiority or self-righteousness. As members of a great democracy we must ever hold ourselves ready to participate in, and to lend support to, every collective movement in which our counsel can be of avail. But with this obligation goes the duty to keep our skirts clear of all unworthy imputation; to be sure that if we receive a retainer for our advice our judgment is not influenced

by the emolument; to be conscious that when we speak or act we are doing so not simply as individuals but inevitably in our representative capacity; that we cannot divorce ourselves from the institution with which we are connected; that not only *our* good name but *its* reputation is at stake; and that what we need at all times is sobriety of judgment, common sense in attitude, and moderation in statement.

We come finally to the most important of all our obligations, namely, our duty to science. This means our duty to liberty and truth. For without complete liberty of the intellect and without absolute devotion to truth there can be no pretense of scientific achievement. To this all our other activities must be subordinated; in this the very existence of the university finds its meaning. When our other duties come into conflict with this supreme obligation, they must give way. Loyalty to our institution is admirable, but if our institution for some unfortunate reason stands athwart the progress of science, or even haltingly follows that path, we must use our best efforts to convince our colleagues and the authorities of the error of their ways. Our duty to the students is unquestioned; but so far as the mature student is concerned, his chief concern is to be initiated into the details of scientific method, while even the younger students who are interested only in general information have a keen appreciation of the difference between the scientific and the non-scientific attitude. So that the more closely we hew to the line of devotion to science the more successful shall we be in satisfying all our students. Finally, it is obvious that our communal obligations can be best discharged by being continually mindful of our position as real acolytes of science. The degree of the appreciation that may be bestowed on us and the measure of good repute in which we may be held by the community stand in close relation to our success in pursuing steadfastly the narrow and rugged path of strict devotion to truth. Let us not forget that in prosecuting this end we need both individual and collective effort. The leisure of the laboratory and the study count for much, but almost equally important is the stimulus derived from contact with our colleagues. And while such contact may assume the form of the narrower fraternity connected with our own specialty, we also need the stimulus of that wider group represented in this Association—the stimulus derived from the knowledge of a comprehensive and unalloyed devotion to the supreme end of our life's work.

IV

This combination of rights and duties thus constitutes the real meaning of our existence. When we contemplate the situation in this broader way we recognize the cause of what may, I fancy, be declared the chief difficulty which we have thus far encountered. With the emphasis that we have hitherto bestowed on our rights and privileges it is but natural that we should have been concerned rather with criticism of others and with protection of self. In every great movement it is always incumbent to remove obstacles, and to tear down before we are ready to build up. The chaotic and uneven development of higher education during the last generation engendered certain abuses which called for reform, of certain practices which needed to be swept away. The result was the growth of a feeling of opposition between the trustees and the president on the one hand, and the faculty on the other; or, to put it more broadly, between the administrative and the educational branches of the university. It was in deference to this feeling that membership in our group was refused to those whose duties were entirely or in major part administrative in character.

We are now, in my judgment, ready for a new phase of development. The critical era needs to be supplanted by the constructive. We need cooperation rather than suspicion. If we have duties as well as rights, we should welcome the aid of the administrators in helping us to define our duties; and we should hope that in this way we should be much more likely to secure their cooperation in recognizing our rights. Notable progress has already been made in many of our institutions in securing this cooperation, and in not a few of the institutions where slower progress has been made, the fault is to be ascribed not simply to the administrators, but also to ourselves, who through selfishness, lethargy or cynicism have neglected to assume our full share of the burden. We can afford, however, to be optimistic about the outlook, for the situation is automatically remedying itself. At the beginning there was a sharp division between administrative and educational functions. With every year, however, the presidents and the deans are being recruited from the ranks of our active members, sharing our aspirations and comprehending our problems. These former members retain an honorary

membership which entitles them to what is after all our chief opportunity, that of free and frank discussion. In one form or another, therefore, we may look forward in the not distant future either to a virtual inclusion of most of the administrative authorities in our membership or at least to a situation where we can count upon the sympathetic cooperation of those who at one time were active in our own management and deliberation. This more than all else may be put in the forefront of our list of aspirations. Mutual understanding, good-will and whole-hearted cooperation will do more to bring us together and to solve our outstanding problems than dozens of independent reports and reams of separate discussions, important as these have been in our past history. We can with advantage substantially increase and extend the cooperative relations already developed through our membership in the American Council on Education, with such bodies as the Association of American Universities, the Association of American Colleges, etc. We are strong enough to have our influence count; we are big enough to be ready to pull together with others in the endeavor to achieve our common ends.

And, finally, a word as to our accomplishments. It is neither modest nor becoming to sound one's own praises; but at a time like this it is perhaps not inopportune to make ourselves realize what has actually been done. This is still far from being adequately appreciated. Most of our work, as is well known, has been accomplished through the medium of committees. If I were to classify our committees into groups it would be somewhat as follows: First are those which emphasize our rights, like Committee A, on academic freedom and Committee T, on the place and functions of the faculty. Next is the group which accentuates what might be termed our opportunities, such as Committee R, on the encouragement of university research; Committee V, on the apparatus for productive scholarship; and Committee W, on the status of women. Then comes the group which emphasizes our duties—that is, Committee I, on university ethics, and Committee Y, on guiding principles. The fourth group is that affecting the conditions of work: Committee B, on methods of appointment and promotion; Committee K, on the sabbatical year; Committee P, on pensions and insurance; and Committee Z, on the economic condition of the profession. Our relations to the students are dealt with in the fifth group: Committee C, on scholarships and fellowships; Committee E, on student assistants; Committee G, on

methods of increasing intellectual interests; and Committee H, on increased migration and interchange of students. Finally comes the miscellaneous group, including Committee D, on vocational education, and Committee L, on cooperation with Latin-America.

If we take stock of our accomplishments I should say that the first group has thus far done its work well. We have elaborated a fairly definite code of principles covering the real content of academic freedom, and we have made some progress in working out the rules which should govern in the matter of academic tenure. Much still remains to be done, but notable results have already been attained. The committee on honorary degrees has rendered a report which may be regarded almost as complete in itself and which needs only to be supplemented as occasion may require. Much the same may be said of the committee on the requirements for the Ph.D. degree and the committee on summer schools. Other committees have made at least important beginnings. This is true of the committee on place and functions of the faculties, although that work needs to be supplemented with a periodic statement of progress from year to year. An admirable start has also been made in the report of the committee on graduate students and the committee on the status of women.

By other committees, like that on pensions and insurance, faithful and painstaking work has been done, and if entirely satisfactory results have not yet been attained, the reason is to be found rather in the situation itself. In the remaining fields the progress thus far has been comparatively slight, largely because of the fact that our efforts have been centered on other objectives. Some of these committees, however, notably those on the economic condition of the profession, on vocational education, and on methods of increasing the intellectual interests are reporting at this meeting and much may be hoped from them in the immediate future.

When we reflect upon our accomplishments; when we remember that we have grown to be a band of some four thousand, soon to be, as we confidently expect, some five or six thousand; when we recollect that we are only at the beginning of our efforts,—we may well feel proud of what has been achieved. But more important than the past is the future. If we remain conscious of our high purpose; if we resolve to cherish our common standards; if we realize that nothing is worth achieving which is not worth battling for; if we determine, while unflinchingly maintaining our rights, to become increasingly

mindful of our obligations; if we emphasize our points of agreement rather than lines of divergence; if we seek by example rather than by precept to instill into others that regard and appreciation which we desire; if we hold on high the torch of our aspirations,—we may illumine the broad path of academic progress, and may contribute our share to the steady advance of the light and learning which will some day redeem the world.

ORGANIZATION OF FRENCH UNIVERSITIES

Note sur l'Administration des Universités françaises, le Rôle et la Situation de leurs Professeurs, par Jacques Cavalier, Recteur, Président du Conseil de l'Université de Toulouse.

En général, l'administration française est très centralisée et toutes les questions de quelque importance sont décidées par le gouvernement national à Paris. Pendant longtemps, en fait depuis Napoléon 1^{er} jusqu'en 1896, les universités ont constitué un rouage de cette machine administrative. En 1896, la situation a complètement changé. Une loi, préparée par Liard, a donné aux universités françaises la personnalité civile; elles restent des institutions nationales mais sont autonomes, ont leur budget propre, leurs propres ressources et s'administrent elles-mêmes; au point de vue juridique ce sont des personnes civiles mineures sous la tutelle de l'État, comme le sont les administrations de nos communes. Chaque université est administrée par un conseil appelé "Conseil de l'Université" dont les attributions et prérogatives sont analogues sur bien des points à celles du "Board of Trustees" des universités américaines, excepté pour ce qui concerne le choix du personnel.

Comment ce conseil est-il composé et formé? Pour bien le comprendre, il faut rappeler qu'une université française est composée d'un certain nombre d'établissements séparés, appelés Facultés: Faculté des Lettres, Faculté des Sciences, Faculté de Droit, Faculté de Médecine et de Pharmacie. Certaines universités n'ont pas les quatre facultés; parfois, au contraire, la Pharmacie est séparée de la Médecine et constitue une faculté spéciale. L'Université comprend en outre la bibliothèque générale et parfois un observatoire. Chaque faculté est dirigée par un "doyen" nommé pour un temps limité par le Ministre de l'Instruction Publique sur présentation faite par l'assemblée des professeurs; il est extrêmement rare que la désignation ne soit pas conforme au vote de l'assemblée; pratiquement le doyen est donc élu par ses collègues.

Le Conseil de l'Université est composé du Recteur, des doyens des facultés, du directeur de l'Observatoire, du Bibliothécaire et de deux professeurs par faculté, élus par leurs collègues. S'il y a quatre

facultés le Conseil comprend ainsi 15 membres. Il est présidé par le Recteur, fonctionnaire d'État nommé pour une durée illimitée par le Ministre, sans intervention de l'Université.

La plupart des Recteurs sont choisis parmi les professeurs de l'Enseignement supérieur. Outre leur fonction à l'Université, qui correspond à peu près à celle d'un président d'une université américaine, ils ont encore, comme représentant de l'État, la charge de l'inspection et du contrôle de l'ensemble des établissements d'enseignement (secondaire et primaire) d'un territoire étendu.

Une disposition récente (décret du 31 juillet 1920) a introduit en outre, dans chaque conseil, un certain nombre de membres (4 au maximum) n'appartenant pas au personnel de l'Université. Ils sont désignés pour un temps limité, par le conseil lui-même et choisis, en fait, parmi les personnalités régionales qui s'intéressent à la vie de l'Université et peuvent lui être utiles. Cette addition ne modifie pas le caractère essentiel du Conseil, et l'administration de l'Université reste entre les mains de ses membres.

Le Conseil de l'Université se réunit aussi souvent qu'il est nécessaire et qu'il le juge utile, en général une fois par mois, parfois davantage. Il délibère sur toutes les questions intéressant la vie de l'Université: discipline des étudiants, organisation générale des études, création d'emplois, d'enseignements nouveaux, de diplômes, fixation des droits pour les études et diplômes spéciaux à l'Université (les droits pour les examens d'État passés devant l'Université sont fixés par l'État et sont les mêmes dans tout le pays), questions financières, acceptation des dons et legs, emprunts, construction de bâtiments, aménagement de laboratoires. Sa prérogative principale est de voter le budget propre à l'Université.

Avant d'être exécutées par le Recteur, Président du Conseil de l'Université, les délibérations sont soumises pour approbation au ministère de l'Instruction Publique qui conserve un droit de contrôle justifié par le fait que la plus grande partie des sommes nécessaires au fonctionnement de l'Université est fournie par l'État. Ce contrôle général contribue en outre, en ce qui concerne les programmes et les études, à maintenir une certaine égalité de niveau entre les différentes universités.

Le budget propre que le Conseil examine et établit ne représente pas la totalité des dépenses de l'Université. Une grande partie du personnel est payée directement par l'État et les salaires correspondants ne figurent pas au budget de l'Université. Les ressources

propres dont le Conseil a l'administration proviennent de subventions de l'État, des droits payés par les étudiants, des revenus, si l'Université possède un capital, des subventions ou donations faites par des particuliers, des sociétés, des villes, ou des départements (subdivision territoriale qui correspond à peu près comme importance au "County"). Les donations ou subventions peuvent être faites pour une affectation spéciale: contribution à la construction d'un bâtiment, création d'un enseignement déterminé.

Pour fixer les idées, je puis citer une université de province où les salaires payés directement par l'État au personnel s'élèvent à 2,832,000 francs, ceux payés par l'université à 540,000.

Les ressources régulières annuelles dont cette université a la gestion sont approximativement de 1,525,000 francs provenant principalement de l'État (835,000) et des étudiants (578,000). Outre les dépenses du personnel indiquées ci-dessus (540,000), elles servent essentiellement à assurer le fonctionnement matériel des différents services, l'entretien des collections, les frais de laboratoires (travaux des élèves et recherches).

Au total l'ensemble des dépenses de cette Université est prévu pour 4,357,000 francs, et l'Université en administre directement un peu plus du tiers; elle peut d'ailleurs intervenir pour le reste en proposant au Ministère des créations, suppressions ou modifications d'emplois.

Personnel enseignant: Comment est-il choisi? Quels sont ses droits et ses devoirs? Je signalerai tout d'abord, pour ne rien omettre, que certains enseignements particuliers sont parfois assurés par des personnes qui ne sont pas attachées d'une façon stable et définitive à l'université et dont la fonction de professeur n'est pas la fonction essentielle. Ce sont des personnes ayant une autre profession et qui acceptent de donner une ou deux heures de classe par semaine sur leur spécialité; par exemple, une faculté des Lettres confiera un cours de paléographie à un conservateur d'archives, un cours de bibliographie à un bibliothécaire; une faculté des Sciences, pour ses écoles techniques, demandera le concours d'ingénieurs ayant des occupations dans l'industrie.

Pour ce personnel auxiliaire la rétribution est fixée arbitrairement; elle est généralement faible. Aucun grade n'est particulièrement exigé. La nomination est faite chaque année et peut ne pas être renouvelée. Elle est faite sur proposition de la Faculté intéressée après avis du Conseil de l'Université, soit par le ministre, soit par le

Président du Conseil de l'Université (cas le plus fréquent), suivant l'autorité qui a créé le cours et qui le rétribue. Cette catégorie est peu importante et ne fait pas à proprement parler partie du personnel de l'Université.

Le véritable personnel est celui qui occupe des emplois régulièrement créés; il est classé dans des catégories bien cataloguées. Ces catégories sont quelque peu différentes suivant les Facultés; par exemple, les Facultés de Droit et de Médecine ont le titre ("degree") d' "agrégé," obtenu à la suite d'un concours ("competitive examination") qui n'existe pas pour l'enseignement supérieur dans les Lettres et les Sciences.

On peut cependant distinguer:

1. Les *Professeurs* (titulaires d'une chaire) correspondant à peu près aux Professors ou Full Professors des universités américaines.
2. Les *Maitres de Conférences, chargés de cours, agrégés*, correspondant aux Associate ou Assistant Professors.
3. Les *Chefs de Travaux et Préparateurs* correspondant aux Instructors.

Cette correspondance n'a évidemment qu'une valeur d'indication; dans la dernière, par exemple, l'enseignement oral est l'exception; la véritable fonction est la surveillance des travaux de laboratoire. Chaque catégorie a son échelle de traitements, fixés par décision ministérielle, les mêmes pour toute la France (le personnel de l'Université de Paris a ses cadres et ses traitements spéciaux); les conseils d'université, émanation des professeurs, n'ont pas ainsi à prendre de décision sur les traitements à attribuer au personnel régulier.

Les membres du personnel sont des fonctionnaires d'État avec toutes les conséquences que cela comporte dans un pays comme la France: titres exigés, retenue sur le traitement pour la constitution d'une pension de retraite après un minimum de 30 ans de services et 60 ans d'âge. Certaines garanties de stabilité sont ainsi données.

Comme il a été dit précédemment, les uns, les plus nombreux, sont payés directement sur le budget de l'État, les autres occupent des emplois créés par le Conseil de l'Université et rétribués sur son propre budget. Il en résulte quelques différences dans les conditions de nomination. Mais une fois la nomination faite, les uns et les autres ont la même situation de fonctionnaire, ils ont les mêmes droits et les mêmes devoirs.

Pour les dernières catégories, maitres de conférences et chefs de travaux, s'il s'agit d'un emploi d'université, la nomination est faite

par le Recteur sur proposition de la Faculté intéressée et du Conseil de l'Université. S'il s'agit d'un poste d'État, la nomination est faite par le ministre, généralement après un échange de vues avec le Doyen de la Faculté et l'Université, mais cet échange de vues n'est pas obligatoire. Pour le Droit et la Médecine, le Ministre est guidé dans son choix par les résultats du Concours d'agrégation; pour les Lettres et les Sciences, par les avis de comités consultatifs qui se réunissent à Paris et sont constitués par des professeurs de faculté (Paris et Province) choisis par le Ministre. Il y a une section pour chaque espèce de Faculté. La section des Sciences, par exemple, examine les candidatures qui se produisent pour l'entrée dans les facultés des Sciences, et dresse pour chaque spécialité une liste d'aptitude aux fonctions de maître de conférences.

Ces listes sont généralement courtes: une dizaine de noms, parfois moins; ce sont des préparateurs ou chefs de travaux ayant fait leurs preuves, ou des professeurs de lycée (enseignement secondaire), docteurs ou sur le point de le devenir.

Au début, la nomination des maîtres de conférences est généralement faite pour un an et renouvelée. Il peut arriver qu'elle ne soit pas renouvelée—mais ce cas est rare. Si les motifs sont d'ordre local, l'intéressé est envoyé par décision ministérielle dans une autre faculté; s'ils sont plus généraux et d'ordre scientifique, il est envoyé généralement comme professeur dans l'enseignement secondaire.

L'intervention de la Faculté et de l'Université est plus précise et plus importante dans la nomination des professeurs titulaires, ce qui constitue l'échelon définitif. Lorsqu'une chaire devient vacante par suite de la mort ou de la retraite de son titulaire, la Faculté est appelée à délibérer s'il y a lieu de la supprimer, d'en changer le titre, ou de la maintenir sans modification. La chaire est alors déclarée vacante et les candidats, avertis par une publicité convenable, sont invités à faire parvenir leurs titres à la Faculté intéressée. Les seules conditions exigées théoriquement sont: être âgé de 30 ans, posséder le doctorat correspondant, et avoir enseigné pendant au moins deux ans; en fait les candidats sont généralement des maîtres de conférences ou agrégés en service dans une université.

La Faculté intéressée (réunion des professeurs titulaires) examine les candidatures et dresse une liste comprenant au moins deux noms. Le même examen est fait ensuite à Paris, par la section du Comité Consultatif de l'Enseignement supérieur qui présente également, par ordre de préférence, une liste de deux noms. C'est le Ministre qui

désigne, et son choix est limité aux noms portés sur les deux présentations. Pratiquement, dans la plupart des cas, les propositions du comité central reproduisent celles de la Faculté et le choix définitif se porte sur le premier nom présenté par la Faculté. Il arrive cependant dans des cas exceptionnels qu'il en soit autrement. Comme il est naturel, la Faculté, s'il y a un candidat sur place qu'elle a eu le temps de connaître et d'apprécier, peut avoir une tendance à le favoriser; elle peut être portée à donner plus d'importance aux considérations pédagogiques, aux besoins propres de l'Université en ce qui concerne l'enseignement. Le Comité de Paris, au contraire, attachera plus d'importance au mérite proprement scientifique, à la valeur des travaux publiés, et peut risquer de méconnaître les nécessités de l'enseignement. S'il y a conflit entre ces deux tendances et divergence de propositions dans un cas déterminé, c'est le Ministre qui tranche en dernier ressort.

On a objecté à ce système que le conseil des Professeurs titulaires de la Faculté, qui est appelé à donner son avis, est précisément privé du seul professeur compétent, que même le comité central a une composition trop large et ne comprend qu'un nombre très limité de personnes appartenant strictement à la spécialité à pourvoir. Il faut observer tout d'abord que si la recherche scientifique reste une des fonctions essentielles du professeur d'enseignement supérieur, il ne faut pas négliger le côté pédagogique, c'est à dire les besoins de l'enseignement dont la Faculté est évidemment le meilleur juge. D'autre part, la Faculté s'entoure, en fait, des renseignements nécessaires, elle procède officieusement à une consultation des compétences. Il pourrait être intéressant de rendre cette consultation plus systématique et de recueillir, par des modalités à étudier, l'avis de tous les savants et professeurs appartenant étroitement à la spécialité envisagée. Quoiqu'il en soit, le système actuel donne dans l'ensemble des résultats très satisfaisants.

Le professeur titulaire, une fois nommé, est pratiquement inamovible. Il est propriétaire de son titre de professeur et du traitement qui lui correspond. Le Ministre qui l'a nommé peut tout au plus, de sa propre autorité, le déplacer d'office pour une autre université ou le suspendre pour un temps limité en lui conservant son traitement. Ceci est d'ailleurs fort rare. Pour des peines plus sévères, en cas de fautes graves, le professeur doit être traduit devant une juridiction universitaire spéciale.

Ces garanties assurent au professeur d'Université une grande

liberté dans l'expression de sa pensée tant au point de vue scientifique, qu'au point de vue social et politique. Maintenant que les universités françaises recherchent la collaboration des particuliers, il peut arriver que des industriels subordonnent leur concours financier à l'attitude politique ou sociale de certain professeur. Même si elle en avait le désir, l'Université ne peut, en ce cas, intervenir autrement que par la persuasion.

Quelles sont les obligations des professeurs au point de vue de l'enseignement?

En général le professeur d'enseignement supérieur donne pendant toute l'année trois leçons par semaine, d'une durée d'une heure qui souvent se prolonge davantage. Parfois il donne une ou deux leçons complémentaires, bien rarement davantage. Il assure le service des examens, licence, doctorat, et participe à ceux du baccalauréat de l'enseignement secondaire. Ce service des examens est assez lourd, surtout à Paris; par suite d'anciennes habitudes, c'est en effet devant l'Université de Paris que la plupart des candidats au doctorat ès lettres ou ès sciences viennent soutenir leurs thèses, quel que soit l'endroit où ils les aient préparées. Ces thèses sont souvent des ouvrages considérables et leur étude demande un temps fort long aux examinateurs. Le nombre d'heures réclamées pour l'enseignement peut paraître faible. Il faut se rappeler que, dans nos Facultés la spécialisation commence lors de l'entrée à l'Université; la culture générale est achevée avec l'enseignement secondaire. Les premières années du collège américain correspondent aux dernières années de nos lycées français dont les professeurs donnent en moyenne 14 à 15 heures de classe par semaine.

Quoiqu'il en soit, le temps de nos professeurs d'Université n'est pas absorbé par l'enseignement et il leur en reste pour poursuivre des travaux personnels. Ils pourraient seulement envier à leurs collègues américains l'institution de l'année sabbatique que nous ne possédons pas encore.

La recherche scientifique est un des rôles essentiels de l'enseignement supérieur. C'est pour nos professeurs une obligation morale de s'y livrer, obligation sanctionnée d'ailleurs par les promotions et l'avancement par changement de catégorie. Ce dernier avancement, par exemple le passage de chef de travaux à maître de conférences, puis à professeur titulaire, se fait uniquement au choix (et aussi le passage dans le cadre spécial de l'Université de Paris qui constitue un cadre supérieur). Il n'est donc jamais obligatoire, et l'on peut

très bien finir sa carrière comme chef de travaux par exemple. Dans chaque catégorie il y a plusieurs classes successives avec des accroissements réguliers de traitement. Le passage de l'une à l'autre se fait partie à l'ancienneté, partie au choix. Le choix est fait non pas par l'Université mais par le Ministre de l'Instruction Publique sur l'avis du Comité Consultatif dont il a été question plus haut.

Chaque professeur d'une université de province ne concourt pas en effet avec tous les professeurs de sa propre université, mais avec l'ensemble des professeurs appartenant à toutes les Facultés de province de la même espèce.

À cet effet tous les professeurs des Facultés des Lettres de province sont rangés et classés dans un même tableau quelle que soit l'Université à laquelle ils sont attachés. Ce tableau comprend aussi bien les chaires créées par les universités et payées sur leur budget propre que les chaires d'État. Il y a un tableau semblable pour les Facultés des Sciences, un pour les Facultés de Droit, un pour les Facultés de Médecine. Le personnel des Facultés de Paris est également reparté et classé dans des tableaux analogues. Chaque année le Conseil Consultatif examine les titres des professeurs à une promotion au choix, en tenant compte de la place occupée sur le tableau, puis établit ses propositions. Pour les raisons indiquées plus haut, il est guidé surtout, on pourrait dire uniquement, par l'importance et la valeur des travaux scientifiques.

J'ajouterai un mot sur la situation des "professeurs de lycée," c'est à dire d'enseignement secondaire. Notre enseignement secondaire français prend les enfants à 10-11 ans et les garde jusqu'à 17-18. Il est sanctionné par le "baccalauréat," examen d'ensemble organisé en dehors des établissements eux-mêmes par les Facultés des Sciences et des Lettres. Quelques grands lycées possèdent après le baccalauréat des classes spéciales qui préparent à l'École Polytechnique, à l'École normale supérieure et aux bourses de licence dans les universités. La coéducation n'existe pas dans l'enseignement secondaire. Dans les établissements de garçons tous les professeurs sont des hommes.

Les professeurs de lycée doivent avoir la licence qui correspond approximativement au degré de "Master of Arts"; beaucoup ont en outre l'"agrégation de l'enseignement secondaire" à la suite d'un concours national. Ils sont inspectés régulièrement dans leurs classes par des inspecteurs généraux qui jouent un rôle prépondérant

dans les questions de nomination et de promotions au choix. Celles-ci sont données en tenant compte à peu près exclusivement des qualités professionnelles. Les nominations et mutations dépendent d'un service très centralisé au Ministère de l'Instruction Publique; les établissements n'interviennent généralement pas. Un professeur de lycée donne environ de 12 à 18 heures d'enseignement par semaine suivant ses titres, la classe, et la matière enseignée.

En ce qui concerne la stabilité de sa situation, il a les garanties, générales des fonctionnaires: le Ministre peut le déplacer d'office et l'envoyer dans une autre ville après certaines formalités. Pour le frapper plus gravement, il faut le traduire devant une juridiction universitaire: le "Conseil Académique," constitué au siège de chaque université par les représentants élus de l'Enseignement Secondaire et de l'Enseignement Supérieur du territoire sur lequel s'exerce l'action du Recteur.

Dans cette note, j'ai voulu donner aussi brièvement que possible quelques indications sur l'administration de nos universités, le rôle et la situation des professeurs. Je n'ai pas cherché à faire des comparaisons avec les institutions américaines, comparaisons qui seraient bien difficiles d'ailleurs, parce que, à la base même, les origines et les caractères des institutions des deux pays sont essentiellement différents.

COMMITTEE A, ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE *

The report from Committee A is in two parts. The first part presents the facts found in an investigation which the Committee was requested to make. The second part reviews the activity of the Committee during the past year, with an expression of certain opinions which the chairman has formed during his two years' experience with the problems of the Committee.

PART I

The Council requested Committee A to investigate the extent to which the principles of academic freedom set forth in the reports of the Association and the procedure in dismissal cases approved by the Association have become accepted by the institutions throughout the country. The Council wished to find out how much effort had been put forth by the Local Branches in securing the acceptance of the standards approved by the Association.

To get this information a list of six questions was sent to the president or secretary of each Branch listed in the January-February (1921) BULLETIN (pp. 61-62). From the fifty-nine Branches located at colleges or universities, replies were received from fifty-four, so that the data here given represent a fair picture of the present situation, in so far as this method of investigation can reveal the facts. A number of the replies furnished copies of the constitutions or laws governing the points inquired about, and others quote from these documents the pertinent parts. Appended to this report is the list of questions sent out.

In order to understand local situations and to gain an impression of the relation of individual members of the staff to the administrative officers, the question concerning methods of appointment was framed. The replies to this question are of interest. In the majority of cases the initiative is taken by the Department. Recommendations are then sent to the Dean, who transmits to the President, who finally recommends to the Trustees or Regents. The President, in nearly all cases, may make independent recommendations. In some

* For action of the Association, see page 3.

cases he takes the initiative when the head of a department, or in some institutions, when a full professor is to be appointed. On the basis of frequency, the method, from Department to Dean, to President, may be said to be the normal method of making appointments.

Of greater interest to this Association is the departure from the common or standard practice. In fourteen of the fifty-four institutions reporting (25 per cent.), either as the result of definite rules adopted by the institution or as a matter of common administrative practice, the general Faculty exercises, in one way or another, some authority over the selection and promotion of the instructional staff, or participates in the development of the budget, thus exercising an influence not only over selection and promotion, but the broader educational policy that depends upon the distribution of available funds.

In presenting these facts, there is no claim to completeness of statement, as the method of investigation was not intended to bring all of the organic law governing the various institutions under careful observation. The statements here made are based upon the replies by a local member of the Faculty, and these replies were in some instances supplemented by copies of the laws or rules governing the institutions. Doubtless there are many errors, but the evidence is sufficiently reliable to show some matters of general interest. The replies are reproduced in about the form in which they were received. They may contain suggestions for other institutions that may be dealing with similar problems.

The Method of Making Appointments

University of California.

The President shall recommend to the Board of Regents appointments, promotions, demotions, and dismissals of members of the Academic Senate. He shall take such action whenever they affect professorial positions only after consultation with properly constituted advisory bodies of the Academic Senate.

Dartmouth College.

"Committee advisory to President shall consist of the Dean and of five other members to be appointed by the President from a group consisting of five professors and three assistant professors, who are chosen by a majority vote of the Faculty without previous nomination. When a member has served

two successive terms on this Committee he shall not be eligible for immediate renomination. The Committee shall serve for one year immediately on appointment by the President.

"It shall be the duty of this Committee to consult with the President with reference to carrying into effect the terms of the vote passed by the faculty on April 23, 1917, and ratified by the Trustees regarding tenure of office, and appointment, reappointment, and failure of reappointment of members of the Faculty above the rank of the instructor."

In voting this rule establishing the condition of academic tenure as here referred to, the Trustees say in section two of the "Agreement" that they "would like in this connection to call attention to the occasional need, for the good of the service, that a member of the Faculty shall be demoted, or even dismissed; and would wish to have the endorsement of the Faculty upon the proposition that, to the extent that this Committee is given participation in the policies having to do with advancement of members of the Faculty, in like manner it shall share responsibility in the occasional perplexing problems connected with inefficient service or non-ability to make their work of advantage to the college."

Johns Hopkins University.

The Academic Council consists of the President, the Dean of the Philosophical Faculty, and ten members elected by ballot by the entire membership of that Faculty. "Its powers are defined rather by custom than by formal statutes." In practice it makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees respecting all appointments and promotions, and on all questions of educational policy affecting the Philosophical Faculty. It also elects annually a budget committee, which advises with the President concerning salaries.

University of North Carolina reports that the President has an Advisory Committee to help him.

Northwestern University.

In the College of Liberal Arts there has grown up a practice, as the result of about ten years' experience, of electing a Budget Committee. Annually three members of the College Faculty are elected by the voting members of the Faculty (Professors,

Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors who have served a term of two years) without previous nomination.

The Dean of the College and the President of the University are *ex-officiis* members of this Committee. All departmental recommendations for promotions in rank and salaries are canvassed by this Committee, and the Budget of this College is worked out in this manner. The initiative for all appointments and promotions is taken by the department heads, but the recommendations pass through the hands of the Budget Committee.

Princeton University.

Recommendations are made by chairman of department to a Committee on Appointments and Advancements which is composed of the President and three members elected by the Faculty from the membership of the Advisory Council. The Advisory Council consists of the chairmen of all the departments. The Committee on Appointments and Advancements makes its recommendations to the Advisory Council, which makes recommendations to the President, who then takes the recommendations to the Trustees.

Reed College.

Appointment, promotions, and removals are presented by the President to the Faculty Council. He first consults the departments concerned and then makes his recommendations, which he brings before the Faculty Council. In case there is any difference of opinion, the matter is taken before the Welfare Committee, composed of two Regents, the President, and two elected Faculty members. This plan is described in *School and Society*, April 22, 1916, pp. 594-599.

Smith College.

Recommendations for appointments come from the chairman of the department after consultation with members of the department of professorial rank. These go to the President. But all appointments and promotions come before a Committee of Tenure and Promotions, consisting of the President, the Dean, and three members of the Faculty elected annually. The findings of this Committee are reported to the Trustees for consideration in the final decision.

Stanford University.

The Advisory Board shall consist of nine members of the rank of professor, one from each of the five department groups, as enumerated.

Elections shall be by sealed ballot without nomination. The election is by the Academic Council, which consists of "the President, all Professors, Associate Professors, the Librarian, the Registrar, the Academic Secretary, such Assistant Professors as have been upon the roll of the Faculty for three years, whether as Assistant Professors or Instructors, and such other officers of the University or members of the teaching staff as the Academic Council may, with the assent of the Board of Trustees, determine."

The members of the Advisory Board serve three years, one-third of the number being elected each year.

The Advisory Board shall advise the President concerning any matters which he may choose to refer to it.

"All executive acts of general importance such as recommendations for appointments, promotions and dismissals, etc., shall be submitted by the President to the Advisory Board for approval before they shall become operative, or before they shall be submitted to the Trustees for their action, when such action is necessary."

"In all cases, in presenting such matters to the Board of Trustees, the President shall state whether or not they have the approval of the Advisory Board.

"The Advisory Board shall be privileged to make such recommendations to the President, regarding policy, as it may decide by vote to be expedient, but no recommendations for appointments, promotions, or dismissals shall originate with the Advisory Board."

"It may, by a two-thirds vote of its members, appeal to the Trustees any differences between the President and itself.

"The Advisory Board may convene the Academic Council at any time."

The Trustee rule (adopted March 30, 1906) on Appointments, Promotions, and Dismissals is of interest. "Resolved, That the following resolution presented by the Organization Committee relative to the appointment, promotion, and dismissal of pro-

fessors and teachers at the University be adopted by the Board of Trustees, subject to amendment or repeal by the Board:

Whereas, It is desirable that all nominations for appointments and promotions of members of the teaching staff at the University and all recommendations for dismissals be made by or through the President of the University, the Board of Trustees taking no initiative in these matters; and

Whereas, It is undesirable that either the power of appointment or removal should rest absolutely in the hands of a single person,—

It is *resolved* and *agreed* by the Board of Trustees and President of the Leland Stanford Junior University that so long as nominations for appointments, and promotions of members of the teaching staff at the University are made by or through the President of the University, no dismissal shall be made without the concurrence of a majority of the Trustees present at a meeting of the Board of Trustees at which a quorum shall be present;

That in the case of the recommendation of the removal of a member of the teaching staff involving any question affecting his honor or moral character, he shall be furnished by the President, upon application, with a specific written statement of all charges and evidence reflecting upon his honor or moral character, and be given an opportunity to present a written statement of his answer and of any evidence he may wish to offer in defense, and a copy of all such charges and evidence, together with any answer and evidence offered by the accused, and the recommendations of the Advisory Board, shall be attached to the recommendation of the President of the University, and the action of the Board of Trustees shall be based solely upon the recommendation of the President of the University and the record attached thereto, there being no further hearing before the Board of Trustees or any member thereof, unless the Board in its discretion shall elect to receive other evidence in aid of its decision, and any such recommendation and information affecting the honor or character of a member of the teaching staff shall be presented to and acted upon by the Board of Trustees separately from anything which may involve his competency or fitness in any other respect. The members of the Board shall not in any case or in any event listen to or receive any statement concerning such matter except in open meeting."

This scheme of operation was the "joint labors of a committee of the Board of Trustees and a Committee of the Academic Council" and "has worked well, protecting both executives and members of the Faculty, against indefensible charges."

Union College.

When a head of a department is appointed the "President is in the habit of calling into consultation the leading men of the Faculty."

Vassar College.

The President recommends, but in all cases involving appointments above the rank of Instructor, the recommendation is made only after consultation with the Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Dismissals. This Committee consists of three members elected by the Faculty and serving for a term of three years, one being elected each year.

Washburn College.

The by-laws of the institution set up the following machinery to deal with questions of appointments, promotions, and dismissals:

A first appointment, as far as practicable, is made for one year, "by the President with the advice of the Dean of the School to which the appointment is made." In case the appointment is made for more than one year, "the above officers, when practicable, shall consult the General Council or such members of it as are available."

Reappointments, appointments to indefinite tenure, and all promotions shall be made by the Board of Trustees on recommendation of the President after conference with the General Council, and with the head of the department concerned.

The General Council is an advisory body to the President consisting of the President, the deans, and elective members from the General Faculty equal to the number of deans, the majority of whom shall be chosen from the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

The election to the General Council shall be by ballot.

If the General Council fails to approve of the recommendations of the President he shall have power to refer them to the Welfare Council, which shall have power to veto or refer them to the Board with full information and with such suggestions as the Welfare Council may deem advisable.

This Welfare Council is a mediating body and consists of

the President, *ex-officio*, three members of the Board of Trustees, elected at the annual meeting of the Board, and three members of the General Faculty, elected by the Faculty.

This body considers all matters and only such matters as are referred to it by the Board of Trustees, by the President, by the General Faculty, by any group of the Faculty or by any Faculty member. It shall have power to adjust such matter, or failing to do so refer the same to the Board.

Wellesley College.

Departmental recommendations for appointments and promotions are considered by a General Committee on Promotions. In case of Associate Professors, only Professors vote for or against promotion; in the case of Assistant Professors, both Professors and Associate Professors vote; and in case of Instructors, Professors of all ranks vote. The recommendations of this Committee voting in this way are then passed on to the President, and by him to the Trustees.

Western Reserve University.

Apparently the most democratic method of appointment and promotion exists at Western Reserve. Here it seems that the Faculty appoints Committees who make recommendations to the Faculty, where the recommendations are passed upon and sent on to the Trustees. The chairman of a Committee making a report to the Faculty is always the head of the department involved. The Dean takes no part. The President may help, but assumes very little responsibility.

Yale University.

Assistants and Instructors are nominated by the Professors (all grades) of a department, to be reported to the Corporation with the approval of the Dean concerned. Professors of all grades are nominated to the Corporation by the Board of Permanent Officers of a "School" (full Professors chiefly) on recommendation of the Professors of a department and by a Standing Committee of the Board of Permanent Officers.

Machinery for Handling Dismissal Cases

The real point of the investigation lies in the facts found concerning the extent of Faculty influence over dismissal cases. In other words, what local machinery exists to give a member of the instructional staff a hearing before his peers, and furnish protection against arbitrary action from either administrative officers or the Trustees. The replies to this question show that thirteen of the fifty-four institutions have already definite machinery for dealing with dismissal cases.

Amherst College.

A committee chosen by Faculty deals with dismissals.

University of California.

Dismissals affecting professorial positions can occur only after consultation with properly constituted advisory bodies of the Academic Senate.

University of Colorado.

Each case comes before a Committee appointed by the University Senate which is composed of Professors of all ranks, the Deans, the Registrar and the Comptroller. This method has been incorporated in a recent constitution and adopted by the Board of Regents. The machinery gives to a Professor a hearing by his peers.

Dartmouth College.

Here a definite agreement has been worked out between the Faculty and the Trustees governing appointments, promotions, demotions, and dismissals. Notice, except in case of grave moral delinquency, shall be given at least three months before the close of any academic year, and in cases of teachers above the rank of instructor who have had at least three years of service, one year's notice should be given.

Every college teacher before dismissal or demotion shall be entitled to have the reasons upon which the action is projected stated in writing, and to have an investigation of those reasons before the Advisory Committee, unless that Committee together with the President shall unanimously agree that for the good of the college the dismissal or demotion should take place without such presentation of reasons and investigation. The Committee

has power, or at the request of the President shall be required, to make public a full account of its findings. (The Trustees expressed themselves as doubtful as to the wisdom of this provision, but were willing to establish the procedure if the members of the Faculty desired it.)

University of Kentucky.

The following provision appears in the Statutes: "Before dismissal or demotion, particularly when there is an alleged breach of academic freedom or individual liberty, any member of the Faculty is entitled to have the charges against him stated in writing, to have a trial before a special Committee of the Senate, and to have the recommendations of such Committees presented to the Board of Trustees, upon whom rests final authority for the promotion, appointment, or removal of the members of the teaching, experiment station, and extension staffs."

University of North Dakota.

University Constitution provides that a man may demand a trial before a Committee of his colleagues, but no such case has ever arisen.

Princeton University.

Before a Professor of any rank is removed for cause, he shall receive a statement in writing of the reasons for the proposed removal and shall be entitled, if he wishes it, to a hearing before the Conference Committee of the Faculty (a Committee of Conference with the Board of Trustees). The Committee, after hearing the case, shall report its opinion, with a full statement of the reasons, to the Trustees. Before final action is taken by the Board, a Committee thereof shall meet with the Conference Committee to discuss the report, at which the Professor shall again have a right to appear and be heard.

Reed College.

All proposed recommendations of the President with respect to appointments, promotions, and removals come before the Faculty Council for discussion; if not approved, they go to the Welfare Committee (two Regents, President, two elected Faculty members).

Smith College.

A Standing Committee consisting of the President, the Dean, and three others elected annually by ballot by the Academic Council shall be constituted to be called the Committee on Tenure and Promotion. This Committee shall consider:

1. All proposed dismissals of members of the Faculty appointed without limit of time.
2. All promotions to the rank of full Professor and Associate Professor whether proposed by the President or by the Department or by the candidate.
3. The findings of this Committee shall be reported to the Trustees for consideration in the final decision of each case; and when so desired by a majority of the Committee, these findings shall be presented at a joint meeting of the Committee and the Trustees.

Stanford University.

The Advisory Board, described above, constitutes the machinery for dealing with such cases. The Trustees' by-laws announce a principle as well as establish a procedure to deal with dismissal cases.

Vassar College.

The Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Dismissals would hear all cases involving dismissal. It is a Trustee rule that the President must consult this Committee. In case of a dismissal, a Professor is granted a hearing before the Committee—the President makes his recommendation to the Trustee Committee. The Professor has right to appeal to the Trustee Committee. The Trustees have agreed to take no action contrary to the recommendations of the Faculty Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Dismissals without offering the Committee a joint Conference.

Washburn College.

Demotion or dismissal of teachers on indefinite tenure shall be made only by the Board of Trustees on the recommendation of the President with the approval of the General Council (with qualifications as stated in Article 10, Section 5).

If demanded in writing by the teacher involved, the grounds of the proposed action shall be stated in writing, and before the

recommendation is made to the Board a hearing on the basis of this statement shall be given before the General Council, the said teacher to be given ten days' notice prior to the hearing. Upon his request a further hearing before the Board shall be granted.

The General Council, here referred to, consists of the President, the Deans, and elective members from the General Faculty equal to the number of Deans, the majority of whom shall be chosen from the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

In case the General Council fails to approve the recommendations of the President, the matter goes to a Welfare Council, composed of the President, three members of the Board of Trustees, and three members elected by the General Faculty. This body may veto; it may refer to Board with full information and such suggestions as it deems advisable.

Furthermore, the rules provide that, except in case of grave moral delinquency, notice of dismissal to teachers on indefinite tenure shall be given by March 1st, and in case of teachers who have served the institution for a period of five years, one year's notice shall be given.

It would appear, therefore, that in case of dismissal, the Professor would have the right to a hearing before the General Council, and in case of difference, the matter could be heard by the Welfare Council before it came to the Board for final action.

Williams College.

The President would consult with the Faculty Conference Committee, chosen by the Faculty for conference with the President and Trustees on matters concerning college policy. This Committee consists of five members chosen annually.

In addition to the institutions that have set up a definite procedure to deal with dismissal cases the replies indicate that the question has received attention in twenty-one of the other institutions. In other words, only twenty of the fifty-four replies admit that no machinery has been set up or that no attention has been given to the problems involved. The following institutions belong in this group: Brown, Chicago, Colgate, Indiana University, Iowa University, Knox, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of Nebraska, University of North Carolina, Ohio University, University of Oregon,

University of Pennsylvania, Purdue, Syracuse, Tufts, University of Virginia, Wellesley, University of West Virginia.

In twenty-one institutions the problems have received some attention, varying all the way from the discussion of plans to active participation in handling cases. Many of these answers are significant of what is transpiring even where a definite procedure has not been developed. In some instances, as a matter of practice rather than by statutory provisions, there has grown up a procedure by which the Faculty exercises an important influence over dismissals. Quotation from these replies will show this unofficial development.

University of Cincinnati.

In two cases the following action was taken:

1. The President asked the Local Branch to investigate, and the action of the administrative officers was approved.
2. The Branch requested the Board to have a full discussion of the case. This was approved and a representation of the Branch attended the hearing. The discussion was properly conducted and the Professor was retained in service.

Drake University.

A Professor was restored, when removal seemed a violation of academic freedom.

University of Idaho.

The Local Branch has taken up with the new President the question of more power for the Faculty, which was granted.

University of Kansas.

The Local Branch through its members in the University Senate began a movement for a modification of constitution of the University, and a Committee for that purpose was elected, but a change in Chancellors delayed work of Committee.

Lafayette College.

The Branch has taken up one case, and the President approved of the action of the Branch in so doing.

University of Maine.

A Committee of Conference with the Trustees is under discussion, to which such cases might be referred.

University of Missouri.

The Local Branch proposed a scheme to the General Faculty, but the Faculty voted it down. The plan proposed principles as well as a method of procedure along the line of those suggested by the A. A. U. P. (Copy of this plan appears in January-February, 1921, BULLETIN of A. A. U. P.)

University of Nevada.

Faculty tried to get through a resolution establishing a Faculty Advisory Committee to the President on all matters of university policy, but the objection of the President defeated the resolution.

University of New York.

The Local Branch introduced a resolution calling for such a body (a Judicial Committee), but was not able to press it to a vote of the Faculty.

Northwestern University.

The Statutes of the University provide the following rule: "A Faculty or any member of a Faculty may present to the Board of Trustees or its Executive Committee, a report or a petition, transmitted through the President, on any matter concerning the interests of any School or College of the University. At convenient intervals, or upon the request of ten Faculty members, the President shall arrange for conferences between the Board of Trustees and the Faculties, or representatives thereof, for the discussion of educational policies or the conditions and needs of the University and its several Schools."

This rule has been used only on questions of general educational needs and policy, but could be invoked for other conditions if the occasion warranted.

The Local Branch has under consideration the establishment of a Judicial Committee.

Swarthmore College.

The Local Branch has drawn up a "memorandum" on tenure and presented same to the President.

University of Texas.

In practice the President consults with a Committee of Faculty. If question of Academic Freedom is involved, the President includes representation of the Branch of this Association. The practice seems to conform closely to the recommendations of the A. A. U. P. and apparently the Regents approve the practice. The uncertain factors seem to be the pressure through the legislature.

Trinity College.

Power of dismissal solely in hands of Trustees. Their rules provide that "no Professor shall be dismissed or requested to resign except after the presentation to him of a written statement of the reasons for such action, to which statement he shall have opportunity to reply."

Tulane University.

Only one case in fifteen years. The move for dismissal originated within the Faculty, recommendation to dismiss was made to President by Faculty, after investigation. When presented to the Board a Committee was appointed, which included some members of the Faculty. This Committee reported to the Board, which alone had authority to dismiss. The attitude of the President and Board is such as to give confidence that a request for the appointment of a Judicial Committee would be granted.

Union College.

The Joint Conference Committee of Faculty and Trustees would doubtless discuss any case that should arise.

Western Reserve University.

No special machinery, largely because the whole case is already within the hands of the Faculty.

University of Wisconsin.

The University Committee, consisting of five members elected by the Faculty, would be called in.

University of Yale.

The permanent officers would no doubt organize machinery on short notice.

Certain conclusions seem apparent from the information that has come to the Committee in the form herein indicated.

1. There has developed a considerable faculty influence in the control of appointments and dismissals in the institutions studied. Among these are both large and small institutions; both state and endowed institutions. It would seem from the replies that there has been less attention in state than in endowed institutions. Certainly the most completely organized plans of procedure for exercising faculty influence in protecting professional standards of academic freedom and tenure appear in endowed institutions. The problem is more difficult to deal with in a state university on account of the legal relations, and this may explain the difference found.

2. The principles set up by this Association are gradually becoming recognized as reasonable standards to be attained. An examination of the statutory provisions that have been adopted in recent years will clearly reveal internal evidence of familiarity with the declarations of this Association on the points covered.

The identical phrases appear in some of these documents that are found in the pronouncements of our Association. It would seem, then, that gradually and with no blare of trumpets the Association has been a potent influence in formulating an opinion in respect to the proper professional standing of the instructional staff of our colleges and universities; in determining what protection is necessary to promote research and the promulgation of truth; what procedure in terminating contractual relations is in keeping with the vital interests of the teacher or research student, and the dignity of the institution. Evidence appears to show that members of the profession frown on incompetency and inefficiency and that faculty members have shown fearlessness in taking the initiative to remove incompetent and inefficient teachers. It is evident that the right to participate in the determination of policies affecting the interests of the Faculty will carry with it responsibilities not previously assumed. There cannot be authority without responsibility.

3. Finally, the evidence shows that while Local Branches in a number of institutions, but not in all, have taken an active part in bringing about the results above described, in a great majority of the instances studied the Branches have not been as potent an influence as the effective formulation of standards by the Association. There has been a large degree of inactivity on the part of the Branches. Whether this can or should be otherwise is not part

of the purpose of this investigation. Judged by the replies received, no other conclusion can be drawn.

The replies suggest one possible means by which the Local Branch can become more effective. In a good many of the returns and from other letters received, it is evident that the local members are not familiar with the previous reports of the Association nor at all times with the work which the various Committees are attempting to do. Members who have joined the Association since the earlier reports were made, are probably unacquainted with the pronouncements of the Association on the many questions that have come before it. The Local Branch is a convenient medium by which this information, whether found in previous reports or contained in the work of current Committees, can be brought to the attention of the local members. Discussion of these matters, especially in their adaptation to local situations, will tend to create an interest and aid in developing a public opinion among the members of the profession, from whom the educating influences on general public opinion pertaining to these questions of such vital interest to the profession must come.

PART II

The following summary of the activities of Committee A during the past year is presented. The Committee has had presented to it during the year but four new cases. One of these was voluntarily withdrawn, one has received the sanction of the Committee for an investigation, and two are under consideration.

Two pending reports have been completed, and approved, by the Committee, and advanced for publication. In one of these reports, the action of the institution was upheld, while in the other the verdict of the Committee was that a serious mistake was made by the institution and an injustice done the men involved. A third report is in the hands of the Chairman and will be presented to the Committee as soon as certain preliminary correspondence can be had and an agreement reached on certain details of the report.

In two of the new cases there appears to be a question of a violation of academic freedom. From the point of view of the Association, these cases should furnish a basis for careful discrimination in the use of the principles laid down in the previous pronouncements on this subject.

The method of handling such cases presents a real problem for the

Association. Our present method is as follows: A case reaches the attention of the Chairman of Committee A, who makes such preliminary investigation as he thinks wise. Usually documents are submitted by the party affected, but these may be colored by his personal interests. Statements concerning the case made by friends are likely to be biased. Correspondence with the administrative officers of the institution often adds a different story. From these sources the Chairman has to decide whether or not an investigation is warranted.

Then the case is presented to the Committee, which is composed of fourteen or fifteen members distributed from one end of the country to the other; with the request for a vote authorizing an investigation. By the time this vote of the Committee is taken, a considerable time has elapsed. Then the Chairman of Committee A must secure a group of men willing to undertake the investigation. In making this selection two principles have been followed. First, the investigating Committee should represent different fields of learning, thus bringing the question at issue under the scrutiny of men with different training and problems. It has been thought greater confidence would be given to reports that were convincing to men accustomed to deal with different educational questions. The second principle has been to find either a chairman or some member of the sub-committee sufficiently near the institution involved that first-hand investigation may be made without drawing too heavily upon the funds of the Association.

The burden of the investigation falls upon the chairman of the sub-committee. He collects the facts, formulates the report, and then submits the same to his colleagues on this Committee. When agreement is reached the report comes back to the Chairman of Committee A, who is supposed to scrutinize it to make sure that the procedure of investigation approved by the Committee has been followed and to see if the report conforms in the main with the principles of the Association. He then must lay before Committee A a statement of conclusions, with certification that the report has been made in accordance with approved rules, and with a request for authorization to publish. A practice has grown up in connection with the publication of these reports that the sub-committee of investigation alone is responsible for the facts contained in the report. It is apparent, therefore, that the real responsibility for these reports and the real work done on them is by the Chairman of the investigating Committee and the Chairman of Committee A. It is also apparent that of

necessity a very long time will elapse between the case and the report. From the point of view of the man, this is frequently a very annoying situation. From the point of view of the Association interested in developing a sound public opinion in regard to the questions of tenure and academic freedom, the time element is not of so much concern. The fact that the trustees and administrative officers of an institution have had to face a concrete case and think of the issues involved creates the atmosphere in which the educating influences of the Association can best be made effective. As the result of every case there has been a wide circle of educating influence. The discussion of the case has touched a much larger group of persons than those immediately affected. But to the man the method is slow and unsatisfactory.

Consequently there is a real problem here for the Association. If a method can be devised which will shorten materially the time between a case and the report of this Association it would be helpful. It is also a question whether the administrative officers should not be brought more closely into connection with these investigations, so that the issues raised by the individual cases may be brought to bear on the principles for which the Association is to stand.

The suggestions made by the Secretary of our Association appearing in the December, 1920, issue of the *Educational Review* appear to me to have much merit in them. The results found in the investigation contained in Part I of this report add to my conviction that something along this line can be profitably undertaken by this Association. The influence of accepted codes is powerful. Hence I wish to embody the suggestions of Secretary Tyler in this report as a basis for further discussion by this Association.

"1. An acceptable standard code of what academic freedom means and of what it does not mean should be worked out by collaboration of the parties in interest. The university teachers are now in a position to do this as never before through the Association of University Professors, with its membership of 3500 and its five years' varied experience in dealing with specific problems. The administrative agencies have no single organization, but would be representable by the Association of American Universities, the Association of American Colleges, etc.—or more completely by the American Council on Education. A code once well established would be gradually extended and perfected by actual experience in applying it.

"2. A standard procedure should be agreed upon, which should protect the individual teacher against injustice and protect the

administration against the imputation—just, or unjust—of prejudice or arbitrary action. This procedure might be carried out under the direction of a national joint committee, dealing with principles and general policies, with a system of regional subcommittees, composed mainly—but not exclusively—of university teachers, which should review evidence and report findings. Actual power would remain as now with the individual boards of trustees, but if the plan was successful, few boards of trustees would act counter to its recommendations.

"The guiding principle of these proposals and the consistent aim in applying them should be essentially prevention rather than mere investigation of facts accomplished. The recognition of larger responsibility of the teaching profession for the standards of its members would be conscientiously met. Teachers of erratic tendencies would be steadied by the existence of such standards and the knowledge that only within certain recognized bounds will their profession protect them. Teachers would be safeguarded by their consciousness of professional membership. The administration disposed to be arbitrary would hesitate to incur the consequences and would take more pains as to its basis for charges of inefficiency. Parochial boards of trustees would find it less easy than now to improvise arbitrary standards. The systematic cooperation of trustees and teachers would be instructive to both. In many cases there would be opportunity for mediatory action of an informal sort which would forestall serious difficulties."

In the report from this Committee last year, attention was called to the fact that one institution had accepted "a gift for the specific purpose of controlling the teaching of the chair thus endowed." This is a matter that should receive the unqualified condemnation of the entire teaching profession. In connection with this question it will be of interest to the members of this Association to see what the President of one of our great universities has to say in his annual report on this subject (President Butler in 1919 Annual Report):

"Under no circumstances should, or can, any self-respecting university accept a gift upon conditions which fix or hamper its complete freedom in the control of its own educational policies and activities. To accept a gift on condition that a certain doctrine or theory be taught or be not taught, or on condition that a certain administrative policy be pursued or be not pursued, is to surrender a university's freedom and to strike a blow at what should be its characteristic independence. Indeed, any donor who would venture to attempt to bind a university, either as to the form or the content of its teaching or as to its administrative policies, would be a dangerous person. Unless

the public can have full faith in the intellectual and moral integrity of its universities and complete confidence that they direct and are responsible for their own policies, there can be no proper and helpful relationship between the universities and the public. A university may accept a gift to extend and improve its teaching of history, but it may not accept a gift to put a fixed and definite interpretation, good for all time, upon any facts of history. A university may accept a gift to increase the salaries of its professors, but it may not accept a gift for such purpose on condition that the salaries of professors shall never exceed a stated maximum, or that some professors shall be restricted as others are not in their personal literary or scientific activities. No university is so poor that it can afford to accept a gift which restricts its independence, and no university is so rich that it would not be impoverished by an addition to its resources which tied the hands of its governing boards."

The right of a man to make a gift for the purpose of advancing his own ideas is unquestioned as is also the right of an institution to accept a gift subject to the stipulations of the donor. However, when an institution accepts a gift with such terms, it ceases to be an institution in which truth is sought and taught. Freedom of research and learning dies at that institution and it thereafter exists for propaganda purposes. There is just as much reason for an institution to accept a bequest from the American Federation of Labor for the purpose of teaching the principles of trade unionism acceptable to that organization, or to accept a gift from some wealthy disciple of Socialism for the purpose of spreading the doctrines of Socialism, as for an institution to accept a gift from a wealthy business man for the purpose of teaching the social, economic, and political ideas that are acceptable to him. In each case the institution would exist for propaganda purposes. The Rand School of New York was founded definitely for such a purpose. No complaint can be made when the purpose is clearly set forth. But when an institution pretends that research and teaching are free within its doors and makes its appeal to the public on that basis and then accepts a gift that controls the freedom of teaching, the case is very different.

The distinctive function of the college or university teacher in modern society is to give to his fellow-man the results of his investigations in his field of learning. Unless the teacher is given untrammelled freedom to give to society what he finds or believes to be true, society is not getting from him the service for which he is set apart. His findings may contain errors, but his col-

leagues will soon discover false assumptions, false reasoning, and expose them. All knowledge has been developed in this way, each investigator contributing his bit to the sum total of truth. In so far as an institution interferes with the freedom of the scholar and attempts to limit the findings of his researches, to that extent it is departing from its proper functions. The acceptance of these fundamental principles is an essential condition for wise administration of our colleges and universities. The trustees and administrative officers should keep these basic ideas in mind when prospective gifts are under consideration. In the language of President Butler, "No university is so poor that it can afford to accept a gift which restricts its independence, and no university is so rich that it would not be impoverished by an addition to its resources which tied the hands of its governing boards." The alternative policy leads surely to the decay of intellectual life. There can be no rational progress for the community unless the inquiry for truth is free, open-minded, and frank.

For the Committee,

F. S. DEIBLER,
Chairman.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What professorial ranks do you have on your instructional staff?
2. Who appoints? (Head or chairman of department, dean, president. Indicate method of appointment.)
3. State the tenure of each rank—(e.g., instructor—yearly appointment; assistant professor—term of years; professor—indefinite appointment. Please give rules, if any, and general practice where specific rules have not been adopted.)
4. Do you have any machinery for dealing with dismissal cases involving a violation of academic freedom? If so, give composition of body, how appointed, and any statement showing its operation.
5. Has the Local Branch undertaken to secure the adoption of a judicial committee to deal with dismissal cases?
6. Has the Local Branch undertaken to secure the adoption of principles of tenure similar to those recommended by the A.A.U.P.?

COMMITTEE B, METHODS OF APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION *

From two or three sources suggestions have come to the attention of this Committee as to the desirability of a national registration bureau where information could be obtained by those having collegiate or university appointments to fill. It has been pointed out that it is often difficult for heads of departments and other administrative officers to find out where men and women can be found for new positions. It has been pointed out that many men and women who have not taken a degree or are about to take a degree, hesitate to sign with commercial bureaus. It has been suggested that if such an undertaking should be successful, it might become later on a place through which even higher positions might be filled.

The Chairman of the Committee sent a letter to the members of Committee B, asking whether, in their opinion, we should take under consideration the question of the formation of a Bureau of Information; and then further, if an affirmative answer were given, whether, in their opinion, this Association should undertake the formation of such a bureau, or whether it should try to find some other organization better prepared to undertake the work.

Ten members replied, seven stating that they think the Association should not undertake the running of such a bureau. Two stated that it might be better to leave the formation of such agencies to the universities. One member thinks that our Association should form such a bureau.

Six members of the ten believe that we should try to find some institution that would be willing to undertake the management of a National Bureau of Information. As this seems to be the majority opinion, the Chairman begs to lay before the Association the following proposals:

(1) If this Association can find some national organization in which it has confidence, that it empower its officers to approach such an organization in order to find out whether it will consider the formation of a bureau of information for college and university appointments. The details of such an arrangement will have to be left open at present until further plans can be matured. As a practical

* For action of the Association, see page 3.

step forward, it is suggested that the American Council on Education be asked whether it would be interested in this plan and whether it is in a position to form such a bureau. Your Chairman has had an informal conversation with Dr. Capen, and is of the opinion that the Council on Education would take this matter under consideration if the formation of this bureau is endorsed wholeheartedly by the American Association of University Professors.

(2) The relation of such a national bureau to local bureaus should be carefully examined. It is scarcely necessary to point out that there is here no conflict but that a national bureau might go far towards coordinating local agencies. They look especially after their own men and naturally give them the preference over men from other institutions. It is clear that those seeking information will be glad not only to get it from the local agencies, but will often desire to look over the whole field. It may be true that the larger universities in the populous parts of the country do not feel the need of a national bureau so much as do the smaller universities not so favorably placed. Nevertheless, a national bureau covering a wider field might be of far-reaching service.

(3) The relation of a national bureau to commercial agencies should be carefully looked into before final action is taken. These agencies are largely concerned with positions in high schools, while the proposed national bureau will probably deal with men for collegiate and university positions. Even if there should be some conflict here, this need not, perhaps, be given too great weight provided the establishment of a national bureau meets a real need.

(4) Whether this Association desires to become in any way affiliated with the establishment of a national undertaking of this sort, after it has once been launched, is a question that the Committee would like to have fully discussed in open meeting. Such an arrangement could no doubt be established even if this Association undertook no further responsibility than that of advisor through one of its committees.

(5) Committee B asks, therefore, that the main question here brought forward be put to a vote. It will also welcome any suggestions that will be helpful in the organization of a national bureau of information if the vote is favorable for its establishment.

For the Committee,

T. H. MORGAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE G, METHODS OF INCREASING THE INTELLECTUAL INTEREST AND RAISING THE INTELLECTUAL STANDARDS OF UNDERGRADUATES (*Preliminary Report*)

During the autumn of 1921 the Committee has prepared a survey of the field of its work, listing and classifying a large number of methods which have been proposed for advancing the intellectual interest and standards of undergraduates. Since the work of the Committee strikes so deeply into the essential problems of undergraduate education, the Committee has framed, with immediate view to its own guidance, a tentative definition of the purpose of undergraduate education. The Committee has drawn up also a preliminary bibliography of studies bearing on its field of work.

The survey of the field of work and the tentative definition of the purpose of undergraduate education are printed herewith in the hope that they may be of interest to the Chapters and to individual members of the Association, and in the hope that suggestions of any sort for the improvement of either document may be sent to the Chairman of the Committee by Chapters or by individual members.

The survey is simply a classified list of possible methods, some old and some new, prepared as a point of departure for detailed study. No one of the methods has as yet been examined in itself by the Committee. The inclusion of a method in the list, therefore, does not necessarily mean that the Committee will recommend the method in question: the report in some cases may very possibly be adverse. The several methods vary greatly in importance. Some of them will be treated very briefly, and some perhaps will be disregarded entirely, in the final report of the Committee. The statements in the survey are exceedingly brief, and no suggestion is made as to means whereby the several methods could be made effective.

To some readers the general appearance of the survey may be repellently mechanical. Consideration of the general analysis with which the survey begins will perhaps serve to show, however, that the attitude of the Committee is not in reality mechanical. The Committee intends always to bear in mind, in the development of its work, the fact that the problem is fundamentally a human problem.

The final report of the Committee will afford for each method discussed an adequate description of the method, a statement of practical experience in the use of the method, recommendations for or against the adoption of the method, and suggestions as to means whereby the method, if recommended, could be made effective. These recommendations and suggestions will be of a general character. It is our hope that the final report of the Committee may ultimately be restudied by the individual institutions with a view to the adaptation of the general recommendations and suggestions to the specific needs and opportunities of the institution in question.

The Committee hopes that each Chapter may have a cooperating Committee on Methods of Advancing the Intellectual Interest and Standards of Undergraduates; and asks that the Chairman of each such Committee now in existence communicate with the Chairman of the national Committee if he has not already done so; and that the Chairman of each such Committee hereafter appointed communicate, on appointment, with the Chairman of the national Committee.

The Committee would be particularly glad to have the Chapters during the coming year discuss (a) the Committee's tentative definition of the purpose of undergraduate education; and (b) the question of special initiatory courses for freshmen. Material bearing on this latter problem will be published in an early number of the BULLETIN.

Furthermore, the Committee would welcome offers of cooperation from individual members of the Association. There is much to be done (particularly in the examination of books and articles bearing on the problem) in which the help of an individual willing to spend two hours or more in reading for the Committee would be very valuable.

Survey of the Field of Work of Committee G

The field of work of this Committee falls into three divisions.

The quality of the intellectual interest and standards of the undergraduate depends primarily upon the quality of the intellectual interest and standards of his instructors. Instructors whose own intellectual life is deep, wide, and active will tend to stimulate the intellectual life of their students. Instructors whose own intellectual life is shallow, narrow, and sluggish will tend to weaken the intellectual life of their students.

The conditions of instruction and of curricular administration* may favor or may impede the stimulation of the intellectual life of the undergraduate. Ideal conditions would permit a maximum of such stimulation; bad conditions reduce it to a minimum.

Similarly the general conditions of undergraduate life may favor or may impede the stimulation of the intellectual life of the undergraduate.

We have, then, three problems:

A. By what methods may the quality of the intellectual life of the instructing force be maintained and developed?

B. By what methods may the conditions of instruction and of curricular administration be so controlled as most to favor the stimulation of the intellectual life of the undergraduate?

C. By what methods may the general conditions of undergraduate life be so controlled as most to favor the stimulation of the intellectual life of the undergraduate?

A suggested method applicable in the solution of all these problems is:

1. The development in all concerned, including the undergraduate, of a common sense of the purpose of undergraduate education.

The several problems A, B, and C are now to be separately considered.

A

By what methods may the quality of the intellectual life of the instructing force be maintained and developed?

This problem concerns (I) present instructors, whose intellectual life may be either (a) of at least normal quality, or (b) of subnormal quality; and (II) future instructors.

A condition fundamental for the maintenance and development of the quality of the intellectual life of the instructing force in all three phases of the problem as thus defined (Ia, Ib, II) is the realization on the part of those in administrative authority that the value of an

*The term "curricular administration" is used to designate those phases of administration which are concerned with courses of instruction, admission, retention, gradation, and graduation, as distinguished from those phases which are concerned with supervision of the general conditions of student life, or with financial and physical care of the institution.

instructor is determined primarily by the quality of his intellectual life.

The next suggested method is therefore:

2. The development of such a realization on the part of those in administrative authority.

In the case of present instructors whose intellectual life is of at least normal quality, the following methods are suggested:

3. Intellectual association with other men—colleagues, the ablest students, members of the community.

4. Temporary exchange of instructors between different institutions.

5. Intellectual stimulation through general reading.

6. Interest and participation in discussion, written and oral, and in the experimental solution, of the problems of undergraduate education.

7. Establishment of a periodical devoted to the problems of college education.

8. Extracollegiate intellectual service of proper character and in proper measure.

9. Maintenance of moral vigor.

10. Maintenance of physical vigor.

In the case of present instructors whose intellectual life is of sub-normal quality, the following methods are suggested:

11. Special classification.

12. Elimination.

With regard to the training and selection of future instructors, the following methods are suggested:

13. Application of the methods of improving conditions of undergraduate work and life entered in Parts *B* and *C*.

14. Recruiting for the teaching profession of undergraduates who show notable promise of the development of intellectual life of high quality.

15. Training in the graduate school with a view to development along the lines indicated in methods 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-10.

16. Pedagogical training.

17. Selection of instructors with regard primarily to the quality of their intellectual life.

B

By what methods may the conditions of instruction and of curricular administration be so controlled as most to favor the stimulation of the intellectual life of the undergraduate?

The methods in question are either (I) primarily instructional or (II) primarily administrative.

Suggested methods which are primarily instructional are:

18. Maintenance of intellectual discipline in the individual courses.
19. Improvement of class-room procedure: companionable study preferable to the formal lecture.
20. The preceptorial system.
21. Practical training of young instructors by experienced teachers in the same department.
22. Pedagogical supervision of young instructors.
23. Giving definite directions as to methods of individual study.
24. Supervised study in non-laboratory subjects.
25. Improvement of character and control of collateral reading and writing.
26. English method of reading in vacation for examinations.
27. Improvement with regard to methods of testing growth in knowledge.
28. Relating individual courses to problems of the present day.
29. Establishment of special courses on problems of the present day.
30. Establishment of interdepartmental courses.
31. Special initiatory course for freshmen.
32. Special care given by the individual instructor to the development of his ablest students.

Suggested methods which are primarily administrative are:

33. Improvement of standards for admission.
34. Improvement of standards for retention.
35. Improvement of standards for promotion.
36. Improvement of standards for graduation.
37. Limitation of numbers.
38. Limitation of the size of sections.
39. Election of courses under the guidance of competent faculty advisers.
40. Election of courses for long periods in advance—as for a year rather than for a semester (or term or quarter).

41. System of concentration and distribution of courses.
42. Reporting grades to students with sufficient, but not excessive, frequency and minuteness.
43. Publication of rank list.
44. General examinations in addition to, or in partial substitution for, course examinations.
45. Elimination of non-intellectual subjects from the undergraduate curriculum.
46. Allowance for credit in proportion to grade of work.
47. Allowance of election of less or greater number of courses in proportion to grade of work.
48. Provision of special sections for ablest men.
49. Provision of special courses for ablest men.
50. Honors and other forms of special treatment for ablest men.

C

By what methods may the general conditions of undergraduate life be so controlled as most to favor the stimulation of the intellectual life of the undergraduate?

The influences (other than those officially related to courses of instruction) which act on the intellectual life of the undergraduate are either (1) collegiate or (2) extracollegiate. The collegiate influences which so act are (a) those of an official collegiate character, but not directly related to courses of instruction (general library use, public lectures, etc.); (b) that of instructors so far as exerted personally and not in direct relation to courses; (c) that of other undergraduates; (d) that of graduate students; (e) that of alumni. The extracollegiate influences are (a) that of the community in which the college is located; (b) that of the student's home; (c) the continuing influence of his earlier schooling.

Suggested methods concerning the official influences of the college are:

51. Stimulation of a habit of general reading.
52. Use of libraries and museums for instructional and exhibitional purposes.
53. Provision of public lectures, concerts, etc.
54. Issuance of official publications of interesting and intellectual character.

Suggested methods concerning the personal influence of instructors are:

- 55. Development of faculty-student clubs, or discussion groups.
- 56. Encouragement of individual social relations.

Suggested methods concerning the mutual influences of undergraduates are:

- 57. Elimination of hopelessly non-intellectual undergraduates (equals 33 and 34).
- 58. Maintenance of moral vigor.
- 59. Maintenance of physical vigor.
- 60. Control of undergraduate publications.
- 61. Control of undergraduate athletics.
- 62. Control of undergraduate social activities.
- 63. Encouragement of intellectual organizations.
- 64. Enlistment of undergraduate councils and similar bodies in intellectual enterprises.

Suggested methods concerning the influence of graduate students on undergraduates are:

- 65. Association of graduates and undergraduates in courses.
- 66. Development of clubs or discussion groups including both graduates and undergraduates.)

A suggested method concerning alumni influence is:

- 67. Supplementing of interest in athletics.

Whether or not the Committee may ultimately be disposed to make any recommendations with regard to extracollegiate influences can hardly be told as yet. It does not seem wise at the present time to enter into this phase of the problem.

As a possible help in studying the field as a whole, there is appended a Table, which contains abbreviated indications of the several methods. These indications, which are, in general, not intelligible in themselves, are intended simply to suggest the items of the foregoing analysis.

TABLE OF METHODS

1. Development of Sense of Purpose

- | | | |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| A. INTELLECTUAL QUALITY OF INSTRUCTORS | B. INSTRUCTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONDITIONS | C. UNDERGRADUATE LIFE |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|

2. Administrative Recognition

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I. PRESENT FORCE
<i>a. NORMAL</i>
3. Intellectual companionship
4. Exchange
5. General reading
6. Educational discussion
7. Periodical
8. Extracollegiate activity
9. Moral vigor
10. Physical vigor
<i>b. SUBNORMAL</i>
11. Special classification
12. Elimination

II. FUTURE FORCE
13. Application of <i>B</i> and <i>C</i>
14. Recruiting of promising men
15. Training as per 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-10
16. Pedagogical training
17. Selection for intellectual quality | I. INSTRUCTIONAL
18. Intellectual discipline
19. Classroom procedure
20. Preceptorial system
21. Training of instructors
22. Supervision of instructors
23. Advice as to study
24. Supervised study
25. Improvement of collateral work
26. Vacation reading
27. Improvement of tests
28. Relating courses to present problems
29. Courses on present problems
30. Interdepartmental courses
31. Special freshman course
32. Special care for ablest men

II. ADMINISTRATIVE
33. Admission
34. Retention
35. Promotion
36. Graduation
37. Limitation of numbers
38. Limitation in sections
39. Faculty advisers
40. Election for long period
41. Concentration and distribution
42. Reporting grades
43. Rank list
44. General examinations
45. Non-intellectual subjects
46. Proportional credit
47. Proportional work
48. Special sections
49. Special courses
50. Honors | I. COLLEGIATE
<i>a. OFFICIAL</i>
51. General reading
52. Exhibitions
53. Lectures, etc.
54. Publications
<i>b. PERSONAL FACULTY-STUDENT</i>
55. Clubs
56. Individual relations
<i>c. UNDERGRADUATE INFLUENCES</i>
57. Elimination of unfit
58. Moral vigor
59. Physical vigor
60. Publications
61. Athletics
62. Other activities
63. Intellectual organizations
64. Undergraduate council
<i>d. GRADUATE</i>
65. Association in courses
66. Clubs
<i>e. ALUMNI</i>
67. More than athletic interest

II. EXTRACOLLEGIATE
<i>a. COMMUNITY</i>
<i>b. HOME</i>
<i>c. SCHOOL</i> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

A Tentative Definition of the Purpose of Undergraduate Education

The purpose of undergraduate education is the maintenance and development of civilization through the training of men and women for intellectual and moral leadership.

"The maintenance and development of civilization" is the general purpose not only of the College, but also of the State, of the Church, and of other institutions. The specific means whereby the College seeks to fulfill this general purpose is "the training of men and women for intellectual and moral leadership." The College is the chief agency for training for intellectual leadership; it shares with the Church and with other institutions responsibility for training for moral leadership.

The training contemplated in the definition is in itself intellectual, moral, and physical.

The intellectual training contemplated involves

- (1) Enabling the student to develop and to master the powers of his mind;
- (2) Giving the student a general acquaintance with the intellectual wealth of the world, and with the main human problems of the present day;
- (3) Giving the student a special acquaintance with some one field of intellectual interest;
- (4) Enabling the student to live in an atmosphere of vigorous intellectual life and of constructive intellectual achievement, and stimulating in him the desire for intellectual leadership.

The moral training contemplated involves

- (1) Giving the student an acquaintance with the fundamental conceptions of moral values;
- (2) Enabling the student to live in an atmosphere of idealism, and stimulating in him the desire for moral leadership.

The physical training contemplated involves such constructive, preventive, and corrective measures as shall enable the student to maintain health and strength both during and after his college course.

The leadership contemplated may be in any field whatsoever of human activity. It embraces leadership of the first order, which

involves vision and endeavor of outstanding significance, and leadership of the second order, which involves vision and endeavor of smaller range, and an intelligent support of leaders of the first order.

For the Committee,

ERNEST H. WILKINS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE H, DESIRABILITY AND PRACTICABILITY OF INCREASED MIGRATION AND INTERCHANGE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS

At the close of the preliminary report submitted by Committee H, on increased migration and interchange of graduate students, at the last annual meeting, four questions were raised for consideration by members of the Association. In order to obtain an expression of opinion from Local Branches these were formulated as indicated on the program of the present meeting, as follows:

1. Is there a tendency for too liberal acceptance of Bachelor's degree on the part of graduate schools to the detriment of the Ph.D. degree?

2. Should a closer contact be established between graduate students and advanced undergraduates, at least with seniors, as a general university policy, aside from the limited contact in department?

3. Should the leading universities come to an informal agreement in regard to the scholarly work which may be done with distinction at particular institutions for the purpose of properly supporting these fields, directing graduate students in these fields to the institutions where they may find the best opportunities for their work, and for the purpose of avoiding costly and unnecessary expansion?

4. Traveling fellowships *vs.* resident fellowships.

These were circulated to the Branches by the Secretary of the Association in advance of this meeting. It has not been possible to arrange for a meeting of the Committee for the discussion of the answers which have been received. Very few Branches have responded. The Chairman referred to these topics last year.* In opening the discussion the following observations may be of interest:

1. Liberal acceptance of Bachelors' degrees on the part of graduate students as a rule does not appear detrimental to the standard of the Ph.D. degree but does seem to affect to a certain extent the standard of the Master's degree. The reason for this is that our graduate schools in general confer the Ph.D. degree on the basis of a well-defined standard of scholarly attainment and demonstrated ability for research or other constructive scholarship and not on mere formal completion of residence and course requirements. A student whose Bachelor's degree has not fitted him for the graduate work leading to

* See the October, 1921, BULLETIN, pages 19 and 20.

the Doctor's degree, therefore, finds that he has to complete his preparation before being able to proceed. In the case of Masters' degrees, however, some institutions accepting Bachelors' degrees somewhat indiscriminately also confer the Masters' degrees somewhat indiscriminately on the basis of a fairly fixed residence of one year and the completion of a number of credits without insisting that the major shall represent a definite degree of attainment.

2. The chief aim of closer contact between advanced undergraduates, at least seniors, with graduate students is to develop in the upper classmen as early as possible an appreciation of scholarly ideals. Without such contact and with the generally prevailing requirements for the Master's degree many graduate students, in habit of thought, method of work, and general university interest, are merely continuation-undergraduates. So far, the desired contact, where it exists, has been departmental. Departmental contact is, of course, the first to be developed. In some departments, particularly those where advanced undergraduates, graduates, and faculty have frequent intercourse in laboratories and seminar rooms, close companionship prevails as a rule, but not in others. The question is whether this departmental contact cannot be made universal throughout the institution by creating more interest on the part of the students in the scholarly work of the university at large. Both sorts of contact, departmental as well as general, seem eminently desirable. If it can be realized fewer graduate students will take up their work with the limited attitude of continuation-undergraduates.

3. The recognition of centers of achievement or schools should not be by formal action but by the development of cooperative spirit among the representatives of the various fields. It is claimed by some that universities are reluctant to admit that they cannot offer a student what he seeks or that he will find better opportunities in his chosen field in another institution. If such an attitude exists to any extent we should try to overcome it. A professor owes this to the student as well as to his own institution, which should not retain students under false pretenses. The main point, however, is that certain fields of learning can be thoroughly well taken care of by a very limited number of institutions with established facilities in equipment and staff.

4. The brief statement of the fourth topic, "Traveling fellowships *vs.* resident fellowships," is undoubtedly misleading. It was not intended to insist on either to the exclusion of the other. The fact is, however, that resident fellowships may develop undesirable competi-

tion, while traveling fellowships would always lead the student to the institution in which he can find the best advantages for his particular graduate work. It seems desirable, therefore, that relatively more emphasis be placed on traveling fellowships than on resident fellowships. A resident fellowship has its greatest value, it would seem, in enabling a promising student to continue his work, while without the fellowship his future service may be lost. In some fields, such as the study of history and foreign languages, traveling fellowships seem to be almost indispensable. Very few are available. The fellowships founded for international study since the war by various educational foundations represent one of the most important contributions to higher education, particularly as appointments are made with the greatest care and the preference is given to young men and women of high promise who have committed themselves to a learned profession.

It may be of interest to report briefly in conclusion on the answers received from the various Branches to the four questions submitted to them.

One: All Branches seem to be agreed that a tendency does exist for too liberal acceptance of Bachelors' degrees to the detriment of the standard of higher degrees.

Two: All Branches agree on the desirability of promoting close contact between undergraduate and graduate students, although some feel that it is possible only on the departmental basis. One member reports it impracticable because such contact would conflict with the class interests of undergraduates. It is exactly these interests that we should endeavor to overcome.

Three: All Branches have expressed themselves in favor of more definite recognition of the scholarly work in progress at particular institutions as set forth in this question but many doubt its practicability. One member suggests the preparation of a list based upon past performance. Another feels that the proposed policy would throttle legitimate development in our institutions.

Four: The majority of Branches have expressed themselves in favor of both resident and traveling fellowships.

It is interesting to report that the Committee will have the cooperation of the American University Union in Europe in the preparation of such statistics on international migration as it may determine to undertake.

For the Committee,

A. O. LEUSCHNER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE P, PENSIONS AND INSURANCE *

During the year the Chairman of the Committee has taken up with the officers of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association two matters: (1) the writing of disability insurance; and (2) the participation by policyholders in the control of the Association, and in connection with the latter the desirability of providing for and announcing at the present time plans for the ultimate mutualization of the Association.

It will be recalled that in the report of this Committee made at the last annual meeting there was quoted a letter from President Pritchett in which he stated: "The recommendations of the Committee touching disability insurance will be early met by the disability policy which the Trustees expect to be able to offer within a few months. Provision will be made, of course, for extending the provision to policies already in existence." In a letter dated November 4th of the current year, President Pritchett says: "The Department of Insurance has given the necessary authority for writing disability insurance. The authorization will be completed at a meeting of the Board on the fifteenth of this month, and disability policies will be offered to those policyholders who may apply, beginning January 1, 1922." However, under date of November 16, 1921, in a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Committee by Mr. Clyde Furst, Secretary of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, the following information is given: "Dr. Pritchett has passed on to me your note of November 9th. . . . At a meeting of the Trustees of the Association yesterday afternoon it was decided, after much deliberation, that it was desirable, before acting in the matter of disability contracts, to have more information concerning the experience of other companies with such contracts and the desire to have such contracts among university and college teachers." †

With reference to the representation of policyholders and the problem of ultimate mutualization of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, the situation seems to be as follows: As the

* For action of the Association, see page 3.

† In the Appendix will be found a later communication from the President of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association giving the reasons for postponing the writing of disability insurance.

correspondence hereto annexed reveals, the President of that Association takes definitely the position that it is unwise at the present time to make plans either for the ultimate mutualization of the Association or for any greater representation than is provided for in the plan already adopted. This plan was worked out during the current year in the following manner. In March the Trustees of the Association asked the policyholders the following questions:

(1) Will an arrangement by which 4 of the 16 trustees shall be chosen by the policyholders meet their wishes as to representation on the Board?

(2) Will it be acceptable to the policyholders if Dr. James R. Angell, President of the Carnegie Corporation, which owns the stock of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, shall designate a group of policyholders to meet in New York and recommend a practical arrangement whereby the policyholders may exercise their choice?

To these questions the policyholders who voted (about 500 in number) returned an affirmative answer by an overwhelming majority. In accordance with the vote, President Angell of the Carnegie Corporation appointed in April a committee of 20 policyholders to recommend an arrangement for policyholders' representation. Of the 20, the following 15 were present at a meeting held in May at the offices of the Association:

Arthur Adams, Professor of English, Trinity College

William A. Alexander, Dean of Swarthmore College

John H. Billings, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Drexel Institute

Burton H. Camp, Professor of Mathematics, Wesleyan University

Thomas S. Fiske, Professor of Mathematics, Columbia University

Horace S. Ford, Bursar, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Charles F. F. Garis, Dean, Union University

Christian Gauss, Professor of Modern Languages, Princeton University

James W. Glover, Professor of Mathematics and Insurance, University of Michigan

Frank P. Graves, Dean of the School of Education, University of Pennsylvania

Lewis A. Hazeltine, Professor of Electrical Engineering, Stevens Institute of Technology

- Susan M. Kingsbury, Professor of Social Economy and Research,
Bryn Mawr College
Michael A. Mackenzie, Professor of Mathematics and Insurance,
University of Toronto
Roland G. D. Richardson, Professor of Mathematics, Brown University
A. Wellington Taylor, Dean of the Graduate School, New York University

At this meeting the following five persons were elected as a Nominating Committee for 1921:

- Arthur Adams, Professor of English, Trinity College, Chairman
Burton H. Camp, Professor of Mathematics, Wesleyan University,
Secretary
Frank P. Graves, Dean of the School of Education, University of Pennsylvania
Susan M. Kingsbury, Professor of Social Economy and Research,
Bryn Mawr College
Roland G. D. Richardson, Professor of Mathematics, Brown University

and the following resolutions were adopted:

"Resolved: The nominating committee first chosen to act shall also name a nominating committee of five for the ensuing year. This committee shall be convened by the President of the Carnegie Corporation upon the first Saturday in October of the following year. It will be furnished with a complete list of the policyholders of the Association and will in turn nominate five names to be voted upon by the policyholders for the place of trustee. The policyholders shall elect three, not necessarily from among the five reported by the nominating committee, which three shall be nominated to the Carnegie Corporation and from whom one shall be chosen for the class of trustees of that year.

"Resolved further: The nominating committee shall likewise name a nominating committee of five to serve for the coming year. Each nominating committee will thus in turn provide successors for the succeeding year.

"Resolved further: In case a failure to elect occurs through any cause, the President of the Carnegie Corporation will be authorized to start afresh the process of this operation by the appointment of another committee to inaugurate the process anew."

These resolutions were on the same day submitted to and approved without dissent by a meeting to which all policyholders had been invited.

Under date of June 30, 1921, the Nominating Committee thus established asked the policyholders for an informal expression of opinion as to nominations for trustees, nominations for the Nominating Committee for 1922, and for general suggestions. After receiving the suggestions of the policyholders, the Nominating Committee submitted in October the following five names to the policyholders:

Thomas Scott Fiske, Professor of Mathematics, Columbia University
Guy Stanton Ford, Professor of History and Dean of the Graduate School, University of Minnesota

Christian Gauss, Professor of Modern Languages, Princeton University

William Herbert Kenerson, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Brown University

Samuel McCune Lindsay, Professor of Social Legislation, Columbia University

The votes of the policyholders were canvassed on Monday the fourteenth and it was found that Professor Lindsay had 1008 votes, Professor Fiske 940, and Professor Ford 926. These names were presented to the trustees of the Carnegie Corporation (which owns the stock in the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association) at their annual meeting as stockholders in the Association on November 15th, and they elected Professor Lindsay as a trustee of the Association for the term 1921-25.

As this Committee understands the plan adopted, in each of the next three years one additional trustee will be elected in a similar manner, so that at the end of that time the policyholders will have on the Board of Trustees of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association four representatives chosen in the manner described. As previously stated, President Pritchett's attitude as to additional representation of policyholders is that no plans for the same should be formulated at the present time. Before presenting definite recommendations as to what action our Association ought to take under the circumstances as they now exist, the Committee deems it worth while to review very briefly the course of the negotiations between the officers of the Carnegie Foundation and the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association on the one hand and this Committee on the

other. Such a review discloses that during its existence the Committee has, among other things, urged upon those officers the following four matters, which of course are not all of equal importance.

(1) That the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association be so reorganized as to permit it to write insurance contracts which are participating; (2) that the writing of real disability insurance be provided for; (3) that the policyholders be given at once representation on the Board of Trustees of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association; (4) that plans be formulated and announced at once looking to the ultimate mutualization of the Association. At the end of the negotiations we find that one of these suggestions—policyholders' representation—has been found acceptable and adopted; that another—disability insurance—is still under consideration; and that the suggestions for participating insurance and ultimate mutualization of the Association have been definitely and, it seems, finally rejected. But the Association has as a matter of fact declared dividends much as though it were considering the policies participating.

In the mean time the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association has been transacting what business it could without the endorsement of the American Association of University Professors. Information placed at the disposal of the Committee by officials of the Association shows the following situation as to the amount of business done by the Association.

	<i>No. Ins. Policies</i>	<i>Total Ins.</i>	<i>No. Annuity Contracts</i>	<i>Total Annuity</i>
October 1, 1919	174	\$784,336	113	\$109,438
October 1, 1920	553	2,795,298	450	494,915
October 1, 1921	982	4,973,175	776	917,064
November 1, 1921	1,017	5,151,122	831	1,016,148

On October 1, 1921, sixty-two colleges and universities had adopted the contractual plan of old-age annuities through the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. The insurance policies and annuities referred to above are scattered among three hundred institutions in the United States and Canada.

Whatever action our Association takes must be based upon a recognition of the fact that the Insurance and Annuity Association is doing a slowly increasing business, although probably only a fraction of what would be the case if certain features in its organization did not run counter to the ideas of a very large number of those university and college teachers who have given the matter considera-

tion. Because of its endowment by the Carnegie Corporation the Association is able to write insurance contracts at low rates. Its term policies, especially those expiring at sixty-five, and later years up to seventy, offer one of the most advantageous forms of insurance for university or college teachers who have independent incomes or savings, or are in some other way making provision for retirement allowance. The annuity contracts are also offered at low rates.

A majority of the institutions which have adopted the annuity plan offered by the Association have made participation voluntary on the part of the instructors and have agreed to pay one-half the annual premium, up to an amount equal to 5 per cent. of the salary of the instructor concerned, provided he devotes another 5 per cent. to the same purpose.

In the opinion of your Committee, the chief point for criticism of the plan of organization of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association as it now stands is the fact that the legal ownership of the stock in the Insurance and Annuity Association is vested in what is in effect a self-perpetuating body,* the Trustees of the Carnegie Corporation. These Trustees have, to be sure, consented that the policyholders may in time elect four of the sixteen trustees of the Insurance and Annuity Association. This consent can, however, at any time legally be withdrawn by the Trustees of the Carnegie Corporation, *i.e.*, there are at most moral and not legal guarantees that the representation of policyholders provided for in the plan outlined above will be continued. The assets of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association will ultimately amount to a very large sum, and will be contributed chiefly by the policyholders; but the ultimate legal control of these assets will, so far as present plans go, continue to be vested for all time in a body which can not be controlled by those contributing the assets.

It will be noted that the action of many of the institutions which have adopted the plan of the Insurance and Annuity Association has given that Association a monopoly in this sense, that the university or college concerned will not contribute the additional 5 per cent. of the instructor's salary unless the annuity contract is made with the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. The problem for our Association therefore is: Are the advantages offered by the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association great enough to warrant us in

* See President Pritchett's letter of November 21 in Appendix for an exact statement of the situation in this respect.

recommending that this monopoly be granted to it by American colleges and universities? The answer to this question depends on whether there are other feasible ways of meeting the problem of retiring allowances.

As to this we make the following suggestion. For many years some of the great commercial insurance companies have written long-term endowment insurance maturing at the ages from sixty-five to seventy. Those policies are merely a combination of diminishing term insurance with a pure endowment or savings fund. Based upon past experience of at least three or four of these companies, policies of this kind can be purchased at rates not very greatly in excess of those charged by the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association.* In the eyes of many college and university teachers they are doubtless preferable to those issued by the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association because of the fact that they are issued by companies whose long history is a guarantee of their financial soundness. From the point of view of university authorities the objection to these contracts as ordinarily written is, that on the maturity of the policy the insured is entitled to receive the face value of the policy in cash and may spend the same without making provision for old age; whereas under the plan of the Insurance and Annuity Association the amount of the savings at the corresponding age must be devoted to purchasing an annuity. If we recognize the importance of this latter provision from the point of view of the university or college concerned, as doubtless we should, it seems clear that the long-term endowment must be made to serve the same purposes as the contracts offered by the Insurance and Annuity Association. One method by which this could be done would be to have the long-term endowment policy issued in favor of a trustee or trustees appointed for the purpose; the trustee or trustees would agree with the instructor and the university or college concerned as to just what was to be done with the proceeds of the policy when they became payable. This method has already been adopted in the case of the Teachers Retirement Fund of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends.

It seems to the Committee that there is no good reason why university and college authorities should limit their instructors to the plan offered by the Insurance and Annuity Association, even

* Exact comparison of the figures is difficult, for the reason that the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association does not write a diminishing-term insurance policy exactly comparable to the diminishing-term insurance contained in the long-term endowment contract.

assuming that these institutions do not wish to contribute to the purchase of insurance as distinguished from making provision for old-age retiring allowances. It is a simple matter to separate the premium paid for the long-term endowment into two parts, so that the institutions concerned will know exactly what the instructor is contributing toward a retiring allowance and what toward insurance, and so be able to determine the amount of its own contribution to the payment of premiums.

In view of these considerations your Committee makes the following recommendations:

(1) That our Association urge upon all institutions which have adopted or which may adopt in the future, the plan of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, that they permit their instructors to make their contracts either with the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association or with other approved companies in the form of long-term endowment contracts or any other form of protection that may be acceptable to both the institution and the beneficiary, in which case some appropriate arrangement will be made providing that the accumulated fund, if the policy matures, shall be used to provide for a retiring allowance for the instructor concerned.

(2) That a small committee of the Association, preferably not more than five in number, be appointed, whose function will be: (a) to bring the foregoing recommendations to the attention of the proper university and college authorities; (b) to aid those authorities, if they so desire, in working out plans under which the long-term endowment contracts referred to may be used for the purpose suggested; (c) to report annually to the Association upon the administration of the original system of pensions established by the Carnegie Foundation, upon the operations of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, and upon the Committee's own work in aiding institutions to carry out the first of these recommendations; and (d) to advise, and to safeguard the interests of our members who are policyholders.

(3) That the present Committee be discharged.

For the Committee,

W. W. COOK,
Chairman.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK
SCHOOL OF LAW

MAY 18, 1921.

President HENRY S. PRITCHETT
Carnegie Foundation
New York City

Dear Mr. Pritchett:

I understand that the meeting of the policyholders of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association was held a few days ago. At your convenience will you kindly let me know what plans for the representation of policyholders have been formulated?

If I may judge from your letter of March 31 last, you have apparently misapprehended the attitude of both Dean Stone and myself with reference to the mutualization of the Company. The suggestions of Dean Stone referred to by you (the obtaining of a large number of policyholders who would agree for a number of years to pay a considerable loading) related to the possibility of providing for the issue of participating policies and had nothing to do with the question of mutualization. Neither of us has in mind immediate mutualization. What we do suggest is that plans be drawn up and announced now, pledging the present owners of the stock of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association to bring about mutualization when the Company has a sufficiently large number of policyholders to make mutualization practicable.

Ultimately the larger part of the assets of the Company will come from the policyholders. It is the profound conviction of our Committee that, in view of this fact, it is unwise to leave the permanent control of these funds in the hands of any self-perpetuating body. So long as the legal ownership of the stock in the Company remains vested in such a body, there can be no legal guarantees to the policyholders that they will continue to have any share in the control of the Company.

Whatever objections may have existed to organizing the Association as a mutual company at the outset, we fail to discover any reasons against ultimate mutualization. Assuming that, when the time comes for mutualization, there exists a going concern, well organized and managed, all the difficulties which you have suggested as connected with mutualization at the outset will have disappeared.

Assuming for the sake of argument that mutualization is no better than continuing as a stock company, is it not worth while for you and your trustees to take into consideration the desires of the members of the profession whom you are seeking to benefit? I cannot agree with you that the question whether the ultimate control of the Company shall be vested in a self-perpetuating body or in the policyholders who furnish the assets of the Association is relatively unimportant. To the members of our committee it seems to be the fundamental question. May I not ask, therefore, that you discuss with your Trustees the question of formulating and announcing in the near future plans for the ultimate mutualization of the Company, and give to our Committee a definite statement upon the matter.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) W. W. Cook.

THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING522 Fifth Avenue
New YorkOFFICE OF THE
PRESIDENT

MAY 23, 1921.

Professor W. W. Cook,
Columbia University,
School of Law,
New York City.

My dear Professor Cook:

I am glad to have your inquiry of May 18 and I am enclosing herewith a report which I have just received from the Secretary of the Policyholders' Committee of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association containing a statement of the action taken by the policyholders in setting up machinery through which they could exercise their choice in the election of one-fourth of the members of the board of trustees of the Association.

As you will remember, the policyholders were asked to vote on the question whether they desired at this time to elect four of the sixteen trustees, or whether they desired some other arrangement. About one-half of the policyholders exercised the privilege of voting and by a practically unanimous vote decided that they would at this time elect four of the sixteen trustees and that they did not desire to go further. The policyholders voted also that Dr. Angell, President of the Carnegie Corporation, should designate a group of policyholders to meet in New York to recommend the practical machinery through which this arrangement could be carried out. Of the twenty policyholders designated by Dr. Angell, fifteen were present, the others having been prevented from coming. Of this number a majority were members of the American Association of University Professors. The provisional machinery which they have suggested as shown in the accompanying resolutions, can be easily tried out in the next few years and its feasibility ascertained.

Our counsel inform me that the charter of the Association could be amended so as to prescribe that one-fourth or one-half or all of the trustees shall be nominated to the stockholders by the policyholders through some machinery of election approved by them. For the moment our policyholders do not desire to go beyond the step which has just been taken and which provides for the election by them of one-fourth of the trustees. Whether they will later desire to increase their representation and will ultimately prefer to have all the trustees so elected, and to have this provision fixed through an amendment to the charter, I cannot say.

Whether the trustees of the Carnegie Corporation would be willing now to declare their readiness to secure such an amendment to the charter and to commit the Corporation to a situation in which all the trustees of the Association shall in time be elected by the votes of the policyholders is also a question that cannot now be answered. The matter is really not so simple as it appears on the surface.

In the first place we have two groups of policyholders, American and Canadian. The Canadian policyholders prefer that there shall be no arrangement for designating trustees by direct action of the policyholders. They are not accustomed to any form of mutualization and prefer an organization like that under which their own insurance companies are run. Even aside from the probability that the policyholders themselves will not for many years desire to extend their participation in the government of the Association, it is also true that the trustees of the Association and of the Carnegie Corporation have a responsibility of their own to discharge, and that responsibility is to have the conduct of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association upon the most safe and secure basis. Whether that end would be accomplished by throwing open the government of the Association to the vote of the policyholders is at least a debatable question, even if the policyholders themselves desired it, which at present they do not. It has therefore seemed to the trustees of the Association and of the Corporation that the wise plan was to do what we have done in all these matters, namely, to go conservatively, a step at a time and let the future be determined by the actual test of experience. Do you not think yourself that this is the wiser and more just plan in view of the attitude of the policyholders themselves?

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) HENRY S. PRITCHETT.

THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

522 Fifth Avenue
New York

OFFICE OF THE
PRESIDENT

NOVEMBER 4, 1921.

Dear Professor Cook:

In reply to your letter of the second of November, I send an advance copy of my forthcoming report, which I think gives you all the information you ask. You will note, on page twenty-five, the figures of the insurance and annuity business are given up to November first. You will find also a full discussion of the policyholders' plan of representation and what has been done under it. The first trustee elected in this way will take his seat after the meeting of the trustees on November fifteenth of this year.

The Department of Insurance has given the necessary authority for writing disability insurance. The authorization will be completed at the meeting of the Board on the fifteenth of this month, and disability policies will be offered to those policyholders who may apply, beginning January 1, 1922. It is necessary before that time that the Association shall deposit \$100,000 additional securities with the Department of Insurance. If there is any other information which I can send you, I beg you will let me know.

Yours very sincerely,

Professor W. W. Cook
Columbia University
New York City

(Signed) HENRY S. PRITCHETT.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK
SCHOOL OF LAW

NOVEMBER 9, 1921.

Dear President Pritchett:

Please accept my thanks for the information contained in your letter of November 4 and accompanying documents. May I inquire whether the exact form of the disability policy has been determined upon, and if so, may I have a copy of the same?

I do not find among the documents the names of the five policyholders nominated to the policyholders to vote upon. Can you supply me with these? I shall also be glad to know at your convenience the results of the policyholders' vote, which I understand is to close November 12. I shall also be glad to know when the Board of Trustees of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association have made the final selection of a Trustee.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) W. W. COOK,
Chairman, Committee on Pensions.

President H. S. PRITCHETT
The Carnegie Foundation
522 Fifth Avenue
New York City

TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA

522 Fifth Avenue, New York

NOVEMBER 16, 1921.

My dear Professor Cook:

Dr. Pritchett has passed on to me for answer your note of November the ninth. I am enclosing herewith the circular letter of the policyholders' committee giving the five names presented for the votes of the policyholders.

The votes were canvassed on Monday, November the fourteenth, and the chairman of the committee reported 1008 for Professor Lindsay, 940 for Professor Fisk and 926 for Professor Ford.

This report was presented to the stockholders at their annual meeting yesterday, November the fifteenth, and they elected Professor Lindsay as a trustee of the Association for the term 1921-1925.

At the meeting of the trustees of the Association yesterday afternoon it was decided, after much discussion, that it was desirable before acting in the matter of disability contracts to have more information concerning the experience of other companies with such contracts and the desire to have such contracts among university and college teachers.

Very truly yours,

Professor W. W. COOK
Chairman, Committee on Pensions
School of Law, Columbia University
New York City

(Signed) CLYDE FURST,
Secretary

THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

522 Fifth Avenue
New York

OFFICE OF THE
PRESIDENT

NOVEMBER 21, 1921.

Dear Professor Cook:

I send a line in reply to your note of the fifteenth of November. I have not been able to answer this sooner because I had three annual meetings on three successive days which quite exhausted my time and strength.

With regard to the capital stock of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, this is owned as you remark by the Carnegie Corporation. They have agreed to accept the nomination of the policyholders for a member of each group of four of the sixteen trustees. I have asked Mr. Furst to send you the action of the policyholders in making their first nomination to the Corporation.

The trustees of the Corporation are not entirely self-perpetuating. There are ten members of the Board of Trustees. One is the president, who ceases to be a trustee when he ceases to be president. Thus, Dr. Angell, when he ceased to be president of the Carnegie Corporation, ceased to be a trustee. Of the remaining nine trustees, five are not elected by the Board but are the presidents, respectively, of the Carnegie Institute of Pittsburgh, the Carnegie Institution of Washington, the Carnegie Foundation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the Carnegie Hero Fund. I send you a copy of the By-Laws of the Corporation which sets forth this arrangement. Mr. Carnegie's notion in arranging this choice of trustees was that it made a wider selection and that these separate bodies, in electing presidents, would proceed with greater care.

As Mr. Furst wrote you, I think, the other day, at the meeting of the trustees of the Insurance Association, held on the fifteenth of November, the recommendation of the Executive Committee to offer a disability insurance policy in connection with life insurance was postponed. The reasons for this were these. The Board feels a great obligation to conduct the affairs of this company conservatively and not to endanger the main purpose which is to furnish annuities and life insurance upon the best plan and in the most economical way to the college teachers of the United States and Canada. They are willing to go into any new forms which have been tested and which they feel do not involve them in complications which may endanger to some extent their service. It is, on the whole, a conservative board, and the teachers who form a large part of the board are perhaps the most conservative of all.

The trustees' hesitation to give their approval to such policies at this time was apparently due to the following considerations:

1. The trustees felt that disability was generally understood by teachers to be something quite different from the disability protection which insurance companies now offer in their contracts. The trustees felt that teachers expected that disability would include disability in their profession, whereas it is sharply limited to absolute and total disability.

2. The trustees felt that the administration of disability insurance would

involve expensive arrangements and an amount of work far in excess of the ordinary business of insurance and annuities.

3. In the third place, certain commercial companies now offer disability insurance separate from life insurance or annuities, so that one desiring disability insurance can get a disability contract without reference to his arrangements for annuity or life insurance.

4. In the fourth place, the trustees desired to know whether their policyholders, or any great number of them, desired such insurance. The officers were therefore directed to make enquiries among the policyholders with regard to this matter and report back to the trustees, at a later meeting, the result of these enquiries.

Yours very sincerely,

(Signed) HENRY S. PRITCHETT.

Professor W. W. Cook
Columbia University
New York City

COMMITTEE W, STATUS OF WOMEN IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

To the preliminary report of Committee W, published in the October BULLETIN, should have been added a note stating that only three members, Dean Talbot, Dr. Bigelow, and the Chairman, were present at the Chicago meeting of the Committee at which the report was formulated, and that there was not time to send the report around for approval or disapproval by other members of the Committee before presenting it to the Association. For this reason, only the three members mentioned above can be held responsible for the views expressed in the report. Professors Dewey, Bascom, Beckwith, Bronk, Searles and McKeag have since expressed approval, Professors Wilcox and Munro have written that they are not in accord with some parts of the report. The remaining members have not replied to my letter of inquiry.

The Chairman regrets that through inadvertence the above note was not published with the report in the October BULLETIN.—
A. CASWELL ELLIS, *Chairman*.

PROPOSALS FOR A COLLEGE CONSTITUTION

Some fifty or more college and university people, professors and administrators, have contributed to the making of the plan here submitted for a college constitution. Those whose names appear as proponents are agreed that the principles underlying the plan are worthy of consideration by the profession and the public. They are not, however, in agreement concerning certain details here suggested. The plan was presented to the Council of the American Association of University Professors at their late meeting in Pittsburgh, and, upon invitation, it is submitted for publication in the *BULLETIN* of the Association. The proposals are as follows:

1. The corporate or legal board should be made up of those faculty members who are on permanent tenure and of professorial rank.

2. The lay board should be broadly representative of the civic and professional bodies of the community. Beginning with the earliest classes the alumni should be represented on this board and ultimately elect a majority of its membership.

3. The student body should be recognized as an integral part of the college.

4. There should be a cabinet in which the three above named bodies of the college, and the non-professorial members of the teaching staff, have representation.

5. Officers and committees necessary for the work of each of the three constituent groups or bodies of the college, should be by them elected and have their duties and tenure determined. The executive officers of the faculty should be either voting or *ex-officiis* members of the cabinet. It should be the right and duty of these Executive officers to suggest educational policies and to formulate the budget, which, when adopted by the faculty, they should also administer.

6. The maximum only of the budget should be determined by the lay board. Property and funds should be held in trust for the faculty corporation by established investment and banking companies, selected and advised by the executive officers of the college and by the lay board.

7. Such a college, if a new institution, should seek to serve the employed classes and others not provided for by existing institutions.

It should use its freedom for the purpose of pioneering in the field of higher education and should hold closely to "quality production." Those who are able should pay tuition charges sufficient to cover the cost per student for the operation of the institution. Ample funds should be provided for scholarships, equipment and endowment. Public school buildings with their equipments and public libraries might well be used in the early and experimental period.

Proponents: Henry M. Bates, Law, University of Michigan; Louise F. Brown, History, Vassar College; Arthur G. Canfield, Romance Languages, University of Michigan; Charles H. Cooley, Sociology, University of Michigan; W. C. Curtis, Zoology, University of Missouri; Horace Gunthorp, Zoology, University of Washington; Joseph K. Hart, Education, New School of Social Research, New York; Samuel G. Hefelbower, Philosophy, Carthage College; Wilbert B. Hinsdale, Medicine, University of Michigan; Arthur M. Hyde, History, Whitworth College; David Starr Jordan, President emeritus, Stanford University; Louis C. Karpinski, Mathematics, University of Michigan; John E. Kirkpatrick, Political Science, University of Michigan; Wm. A. Kohler, Economics, University of Michigan; Joseph A. Leighton, Philosophy, Ohio State University; Alfred H. Lloyd, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Michigan; Arthur O. Lovejoy, Philosophy, Johns Hopkins University; Isador Lubin, Economics, University of Michigan; De Witt H. Parker, Philosophy, University of Michigan; Edward S. Parsons, President, Marietta College; James Harvey Robinson, History, New School of Social Research, New York; Fred N. Scott, Rhetoric, University of Michigan; Edwin D. Starbuck, Psychology, University of Iowa; Ambrose W. Vernon, Biography, Carleton College; Charles B. Vibbert, Philosophy, University of Michigan; William H. Walker, Philosophy, Fargo College; Robert M. Wenley, Philosophy, University of Michigan; W. M. Wibble, Mathematics, Whitworth College; Horace L. Wilgus, Law, University of Michigan; A. P. Winston, Business Administration, University of Texas; Arthur E. Wood, Sociology, University of Michigan.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following twenty-four nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions* and will be considered by the Committee if received before December 1, 1921.

The Committee on Admissions consists of Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), Chairman, Edward Capps (Princeton), J. Q. Dealey (Brown), A. R. Hohlfeld (Wisconsin), G. H. Marx (Stanford), and F. C. Woodward (Chicago).

Wellington E. Aiken (English), Vermont
E. F. Amy (English), Ohio Wesleyan
Susan H. Ballou (Latin), Bryn Mawr
O. K. Boring (Spanish), Ohio Wesleyan
W. A. Broyles (Rural Life), Pennsylvania State
John Cawley (Mathematics), Lafayette
James H. DeLong (Chemistry), Lafayette
John W. Draper (English), Bryn Mawr
Frank Oliver Dufour (Civil Engineering), Lafayette
George F. Eckhard (Engineering), Vermont
D. A. Hatch (Mathematics), Lafayette
A. Floyd Heck (Agriculture), Washington State
Lelia Wall Hunt (Home Economics), Washington State
Clyde L. King (Political Science), Pennsylvania
Martin H. Knutsen (Agriculture), Pennsylvania State
Arthur Raymond Mead (Education), Ohio Wesleyan
Anthony Muttkowski (Zoology), Idaho
Claude E. O'Neal (Botany), Ohio Wesleyan
Charles C. Peters (Education), Ohio Wesleyan
Allan Winter Rowe (Chemistry), Boston University
Lew Sarett (School of Speech), Northwestern
Fredrica V. Shattuck (Public Speaking), Iowa State
Harry Thomas Spengler (Civil Engineering), Lafayette
Nathan A. Weston (Economics), Illinois

* Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.